

GOD'S SONS AND THE LOGIC OF THE COVENANT :
DIVINE SONSHIP IN 'JUBILEES' AND ROMANS

Matthew D. Ketterling

A Thesis Submitted for the Degree of PhD
at the
University of St Andrews



2018

Full metadata for this item is available in
St Andrews Research Repository
at:

<http://research-repository.st-andrews.ac.uk/>

Please use this identifier to cite or link to this item:

<http://hdl.handle.net/10023/15590>

This item is protected by original copyright

God's Sons and the Logic of the Covenant:
Divine Sonship in *Jubilees* and Romans

Matthew D. Ketterling



University of
St Andrews

This thesis is submitted in partial fulfilment for the degree of PhD

at the

University of St Andrews

26 September, 2017

1. Candidate's declarations:

I, Matthew D. Ketterling, hereby certify that this thesis, which is approximately 80,000 words in length, has been written by me, and that it is the record of work carried out by me, or principally by myself in collaboration with others as acknowledged, and that it has not been submitted in any previous application for a higher degree.

I was admitted as a research student in September, 2013 and as a candidate for the degree of PhD in September, 2014; the higher study for which this is a record was carried out in the University of St Andrews between 2013 and 2017.

I, Matthew D. Ketterling, received assistance in the writing of this thesis in respect of language, grammar, spelling and syntax, which was provided by David Gruber and Robert Ketterling.

Date: 25 September, 2017

Signature of candidate Matthew D. Ketterling

2. Supervisor's declaration:

I hereby certify that the candidate has fulfilled the conditions of the Resolution and Regulations appropriate for the degree of in the University of St Andrews and that the candidate is qualified to submit this thesis in application for that degree.

Date _____ signature of supervisor _____

Date _____ signature of supervisor _____

3. Permission for publication: (to be signed by both candidate and supervisor)

In submitting this thesis to the University of St Andrews I understand that I am giving permission for it to be made available for use in accordance with the regulations of the University Library for the time being in force, subject to any copyright vested in the work not being affected thereby. I also understand that the title and the abstract will be published, and that a copy of the work may be made and supplied to any bona fide library or research worker, that my thesis will be electronically accessible for personal or research use unless exempt by award of an embargo as requested below, and that the library has the right to migrate my thesis into new electronic forms as required to ensure continued access to the thesis. I have obtained any third-party copyright permissions that may be required in order to allow such access and migration, or have requested the appropriate embargo below.

The following is an agreed request by candidate and supervisor regarding the publication of this thesis:

PRINTED COPY

- a) No embargo on print copy

ELECTRONIC COPY

- a) No embargo on electronic copy

ABSTRACT AND TITLE EMBARGOES

An embargo on the full text copy of your thesis in the electronic and printed formats will be granted automatically in the first instance. This embargo includes the abstract and title except that the title will be used in the graduation booklet.

If you have selected an embargo option indicate below if you wish to allow the thesis abstract and/or title to be published. If you do not complete the section below the title and abstract will remain embargoed along with the text of the thesis.

- | | | |
|----|---|-----|
| a) | I agree to the title and abstract being published | YES |
| b) | I require an embargo on abstract | NO |
| c) | I require an embargo on title | NO |

Date: 25 September, 2017

signature of candidate _____

signature of supervisor _____

signature of supervisor _____

Please note initial embargos can be requested for a maximum of five years. An embargo on a thesis submitted to the Faculty of Science or Medicine is rarely granted for more than two years in the first instance, without good justification. The Library will not lift an embargo before confirming with the student and supervisor that they do not intend to request a continuation. In the absence of an agreed response from both student and supervisor, the Head of School will be consulted. Please note that the total period of an embargo, including any continuation, is not expected to exceed ten years.

Where part of a thesis is to be embargoed, please specify the part and the reason.

ABSTRACT

This thesis attempts to understand Paul's deployment of divine sonship language with respect to the community of believers by bringing Romans into sustained conversation with one text from the Jewish tradition, namely, *The Book of Jubilees*. I argue throughout that a comparison between divine sonship in the two texts is justified because both authors collocate with the theme of "God's sons" the same series of motifs, including a divinely given spirit, law fulfillment, renewed creation, and Abrahamic descent. My central thesis is that Paul assumes certain characteristics of the sons of God in the logic of Romans, and that Paul shares similar assumptions with the author of *Jubilees*. In other words, one can detect a narrative substructure underlying Paul's descriptions of the "sons of God" that demonstrates marked similarities with the narrative of the sons of God in *Jubilees*. Just as the explicit logic of covenant membership in *Jubilees* holds together the collocation of motifs including divine sonship, the giving of the divine spirit, law fulfillment, new creation, and Abrahamic descent, so an analogous, though implicit, covenantal logic in Romans brings together the same motifs. This does not mean, however, that the two authors bring together the collocation of motifs in the same manner. In fact, reading *Jubilees* and Romans together highlights clear differences in conclusions. Nevertheless, these differences only further serve to illustrate that both Paul and *Jubilees* work with similar assumptions about the sons of God despite their theological differences.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I am so grateful for the encouragement and support that are represented in this completed doctoral thesis. First, a debt of thanks is due to Grant Macaskill, James Davila, and David Moffitt. Professor Macaskill helped to foster the early stages of research and to shape the project into its present form. In the later stages Prof. Davila and Dr. Moffitt graciously took over the supervision of my project and guided it to completion. I am also very grateful to my doctoral examiners, Scott Hafemann and Jonathan Linebaugh, for their incisive comments and feedback. Finally, thanks are due to David Gruber who, because of friendship and the love of ideas, invested many hours in commenting and improving the thesis. The time and detailed attention from these scholars was invaluable.

Doctoral work is rarely only an academic endeavor. So, I would like to express my gratitude to Church of the Open Door, who launched our family on this journey, and Holy Trinity, who sustained us through it. Many thanks are due for the many gifts given by both the Ketterling and Newkirk families. Finally, of course, I cannot express enough thanks to my wife Kari and our children Andrew, Siena, and Charlotte. They have provided much needed perspective, joy, and encouragement throughout. I cannot say it enough, but I will say it yet again: thank you.

MDK

Easter 2018

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter 1 INTRODUCTION	1
1.1 PAULINE SCHOLARSHIP’S USE OF <i>JUBILEES</i>	6
1.1.1 PAULINE STUDIES ON DIVINE SONSHIP	7
1.1.2 STUDIES ON NEW CREATION IN <i>JUBILEES</i> AND PAUL	11
1.1.3 STUDIES ON ABRAHAMIC DESCENT	15
1.1.4 STUDIES ON THE SPIRIT IN <i>JUBILEES</i> AND PAUL	22
1.2 OUTLINE OF THE THESIS	24
Chapter 2 THE ETERNAL COVENANT AND DIVINE SONSHIP IN <i>JUBILEES</i>	29
2.1 INTRODUCTORY ISSUES FOR <i>JUBILEES</i>	30
2.1.1 DATE OF COMPOSITION AND REDACTIONAL THEORIES	33
2.1.2 THE PURPOSE AND THEOLOGICAL THEMES OF <i>JUBILEES</i>	37
2.2 THE ETERNAL COVENANT AND DIVINE SONSHIP	42
2.2.1 DIVINE SONSHIP TEXTS	42
2.2.1.1 <i>Children of God at the Restoration and New Creation</i> Jubilees 1:24–25, 28	44
2.2.1.2 <i>Firstborn of God at Creation: Exodus 4:22</i> in Jubilees 2:20	47
2.2.1.3 <i>Abraham’s Blessing of Jacob: Jubilees 19:18–29</i>	50
2.2.2 THE COVENANT BEYOND THE SONSHIP TEXTS	53
2.2.2.1 <i>The One, Eternal Covenant of Jubilees</i>	54
2.2.2.2 <i>Covenantal History and “Divisions of the Times of the Law and the Testimony”</i>	58
2.3 CONCLUSION: DIVINE SONS AS COVENANT MEMBERS	61
Chapter 3 ELECTION IN <i>THE BOOK OF JUBILEES</i>	65
3.1 THE ELECT AND “LAW AND TESTIMONY” AS REVEALED KNOWLEDGE	66
3.1.1 DEFINING TERMS: THE MOSAIC TORAH, <i>JUBILEES</i> , AND THE HEAVENLY TABLETS	67
3.1.2 THE ELECT AS TRADENTS OF THE WRITTEN TRADITION	74
3.1.3 CONCLUSIONS ON THE WRITTEN TRADITION	78
3.2 ISRAEL’S ELECTION AND SPATIAL-TEMPORAL REALITY	80
3.2.1 ELECTION AND SACRED TIME	82
3.2.2 ELECTION AND SACRED SPACE	84
3.2.3 SACRED TIME, SACRED SPACE, SACRED PEOPLE	89
3.3 ELECTION AND RIGHTEOUSNESS	90
3.3.1 JACOB AND ALL HIS DESCENDANTS	90
3.3.2 MORAL CORRESPONDENCE OF THE ELECT STATUS	93
3.4 CONCLUSION: ISRAEL’S ELECT STATUS IN <i>JUBILEES</i>	95

Chapter 4 THE SONS OF GOD, COVENANT RESTORATION, AND ESCHATOLOGY	98
4.1 DEFINING ESCHATOLOGY	99
4.2 RESTORATION AND ESCHATOLOGY IN <i>JUBILEES</i> 1 AND 23	101
4.2.1 <i>JUBILEES</i> 1: COVENANT RESTORATION AS THE CENTER OF THE CREATION-NEW CREATION SCHEME	101
4.2.2 <i>JUBILEES</i> 23: HUMAN LIFE SPANS AND RESTORED CREATION	107
4.2.3 SYNTHESIS OF <i>JUBILEES</i> 1 AND 23	112
4.3 OTHER PASSAGES RELATED TO RESTORATION AND ESCHATOLOGY	115
4.3.1 THE RAMIFICATIONS OF COVENANT UNFAITHFULNESS FOR CREATION	115
4.3.2 THE RAMIFICATIONS OF COVENANT FAITHFULNESS FOR CREATION	121
4.4 CONCLUSION: GOD’S SONS, GOD’S PRESENCE AND THE NEW CREATION	124
4.4.1 SUMMARY OF DIVINE SONSHIP IN <i>JUBILEES</i>	126
 Chapter 5 DIVINE SONSHIP IN ROMANS 9	 130
5.1 DIVINE SONSHIP WITHIN THE CONTEXT OF ROMANS 9	132
5.2 ISRAEL’S ΥΙΟΘΕΣΙΑ AS GOD’S SON IN ROMANS 9:4	134
5.2.1 LITERATURE REVIEW ON PAUL’S USE OF ΥΙΟΘΕΣΙΑ	136
5.2.2 ΥΙΟΘΕΣΙΑ IN ROM 9:4–5	145
5.3 GOD’S SONS, ABRAHAM’S SEED IN ROMANS 9:8	152
5.4 CHILDREN OF THE LIVING GOD: HOSEA 2:25; 1:10 IN ROMANS 9:24–26	158
5.5 CONCLUSIONS FROM SONSHIP IN ROMANS 9	163
 Chapter 6 DIVINE SONSHIP IN ROMANS 8	 168
6.1 DIVINE SONSHIP AS A LINK BETWEEN ROMANS 8 AND 9	170
6.2 GOD’S SONS AS COVENANT MEMBERS IN ROMANS 8	172
6.2.1 DIVINE SONSHIP AND THE SPIRIT	173
6.2.1.1 <i>The Spirit as the Identity Marker of God’s Sons in the Eschatological Era</i>	175
6.2.1.2 <i>God’s Sons, the Spirit, and the Law in Rom 8:2</i>	181
6.2.2 DIVINE SONSHIP AND RENEWED CREATION	196
6.2.3 DIVINE SONSHIP AND THE ABRAHAMIC INHERITANCE	200
6.3 CONCLUSION	207

Chapter 7 CONCLUSION	210
Bibliography	213

INTRODUCTION

The epithet “children of God” is among the more evocative expressions used by the biblical authors to describe humanity’s relationship to God. To call one a son or daughter of God connotes an intimate relationship between humanity and the divine. For the authors of the New Testament, and particularly for the Apostle Paul, the language of divine sonship carries even greater import because of the Christological connection. The many sons and daughters of God are inextricably linked to Jesus as *the* Son of God.¹ Accordingly, for these authors divine sonship not only describes a believer’s relationship to God but also his or her connection to Christ.² This intimate connection between God as father and believers as sons surfaces in Rom 8. Here, believers are led by the Spirit of God and are therefore identified as sons of God (v. 14). The “Spirit of adoption” elicits the human cry of “Abba, Father” directed toward God and, thus, the Spirit authenticates a believer’s filial connection to God (vv. 15–16). Significantly, because believers are children of God, they also possess the full rights as heirs of God (v. 17).

Yet, how should one conceive of the nature of this filial relationship between the human and divine? What does it mean to become a member of the divine family and to be a recipient of a divine inheritance? To describe humans as relating to the divine in a father-son relationship is not particularly unique to Paul and the range of meaning is quite wide. For as

¹ See, e.g., Rom 8:29.

² To this point, I have used gender inclusive language with respect to the phrase υἱοὶ θεοῦ. This is appropriate because Paul makes clear that “sons” of God include both male and female in Gal 3:27–28. Nevertheless, for simplicity of writing and to make clear the lexical connections in the original languages I primarily use “son” and “sons” in the remainder of the thesis.

C. H. Dodd noted nearly a century ago, “In many religions men have been regarded as the offspring of God, sometimes in a crudely literal sense, sometimes more philosophically as a sort of emanation from the Divine Being.”³ Nevertheless, discussions surrounding Paul’s description of Jesus as the “Son of God” have formed a consensus that the background is found in Jewish traditions, typically emphasizing references to royal figures.⁴ Similarly, scholars specifically studying Paul’s notion of the divine sonship for believers typically relate the motif to Jewish traditions, though here with more emphasis placed on references to righteous individuals or Israel as a community.⁵ The Jewish sonship tradition, however, is broad and commentaries tend to cite Jewish traditions as the background of Paul’s divine sonship language without further elaboration.⁶

This thesis attempts to understand Paul’s deployment of divine sonship language with respect to the community of believers by bringing Romans into sustained conversation with

³ C. H. Dodd, *The Epistle of Paul to the Romans*, The Moffatt New Testament Commentary (London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1932), 130.

⁴ E.g. 2 Sam 7:14; Ps 2:7, 89:26–27; 4QFlor. Wilhelm Bousset famously concluded that Paul fashioned his divine sonship language for Jesus after pagan traditions with which his Gentile converts would be familiar; *Kyrios Christos: A History of the Belief in Christ from the Beginnings of Christianity to Irenaeus*, trans. John E. Steely (Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1970), 206–210. Martin Hengel correctly critiqued Bousset’s thesis by showing the inadequacies of the supposed Greek and Hellenistic parallels; *The Son of God: The Origin of Christology and the History of Jewish-Hellenistic Religion*, trans. John Bowden (London: S.C.M. Press, 1976), 21–56. See also Brendan J. Byrne, *Sons of God - Seed of Abraham: A Study of the Idea of the Sonship of God of All Christians in Paul Against the Jewish Background* (Biblical Inst. Press, 1979); L. W. Hurtado, “Son of God,” *Dictionary of Paul and His Letters*, 900–906.

⁵ Byrne, *Sons of God*; C. E. B. Cranfield, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Epistle to the Romans*, 6th ed., vol. 2 of ICC (Edinburgh: Clark, 1979), 397–398; Hurtado, “Son of God,” 905–906; Douglas J. Moo, *The Epistle to the Romans*, NICNT (Cambridge: W.B. Eerdmans, 1996), 499; Peter Stuhlmacher, *Paul’s Letter to the Romans: A Commentary*, trans. Scott J. Hafemann (Louisville, Ky: Westminster/John Knox Press, 1994), 128–131. N.T. Wright is more specific than merely citing a Jewish sonship tradition when he connects the divine sonship language to a “Exodus narrative” applied in the Prophets. Divine sonship designates Israel as a community in Deut 14:1; Isa 1:2; Jer 3:22; Hos 1:10; 11:1; Exod 4:22; Wisdom 2:18; 5:5; Sirach 4:10; Psalms of Solomon 12:21; 16:10, 26; 18:4, 13. References to righteous individuals are found in *Psalms of Solomon* 13:9; 18:4; *Joseph and Asenath* 6:3–5; 13:13; 18:11; 21:4; 23:10. A third category of divine sonship language refers to angelic beings in Gen 6:2–4; Deut 32:8; Ps 29:1; 89:6.

⁶ Brendan Byrne has provided a broad survey of the Jewish sonship tradition and the most concerted effort to apply the findings to the exegesis of Paul’s letters. See my interaction with Byrne below in §1.1.1.

one text from the Jewish tradition, namely, *The Book of Jubilees*. Divine sonship represents a crucial motif in *Jubilees* and arguably displays a similar conceptuality to divine sonship in Romans. That Jewish traditions serve as the root for Paul's conceptualization of divine sonship is generally accepted, but a more focused examination of *Jubilees* and Romans adds precision to the comparison. Specifically, putting *Jubilees* and Romans into conversation better articulates the conceptual structure and significance of "sons of God" for Paul, demonstrating with whom God's presence dwells and under what conditions he does so. As such, this study does not compare Paul's use of divine sonship to a scholarly summary of multiple Jewish texts. Rather, it seeks to understand how *Jubilees* employs divine sonship within its own theological context in order to bring this understanding into conversation with Paul's use. In so doing, the study sheds light on Paul's conception of "the sons of God" by way of offering analogies as well as drawing out differences with *Jubilees*.

I argue throughout the thesis that a comparison between divine sonship in the two texts is justified because of the number of shared motifs that both authors collocate with "God's sons." A cursory survey of the evidence from *Jubilees* and Romans sufficiently demonstrates the extent of the overlap. Indeed, I suggest that the "sons of God" in *Jubilees* and Romans are comparable categories because both authors link divine sonship to the motifs of Abrahamic descent, new creation, a divinely given spirit, and the fulfillment of the law. In the following, I briefly review the relevant literature, offering evidence in support of such comparisons.

In Rom 8 the Spirit of God serves both to identify the sons of God (Rom 8:14) and to bear witness to the reality of their sonship (Rom 8:16). This same Spirit brings about the adoption of God's sons and produces in these children the cry of "Abba, Father" (Rom 8:15). Paul also describes those who walk according to the Spirit, later designated as sons of God, as

fulfilling the righteous requirement of the law (Rom 8:4). He argues that the present suffering of God's sons is not comparable to their future glory because the redemption of God's sons will also entail the redemption of the remainder of creation (Rom 8:19–22). In the following chapter, Paul's argument concerning the identity of Abraham's descendants links seamlessly into the category of "children of God" (Rom 9:7–8). Within these two chapters of Romans, then, Paul links the motif of the "sons of God" with motifs of the Spirit, law fulfillment, renewed creation, and Abraham's descendants.

A survey of the evidence in *Jubilees* demonstrates the presence of the same collocation of motifs around the sons of God. In *Jubilees*' depiction of Israel's covenant renewal, God declares that Israel will be called "children of the living God" (1:25) and that God will be recognized as the "father of all Jacob's children" (1:28).⁷ These children of God will receive a "holy spirit," and this spirit will enable Israel to perform all God's commandments (1:23–24). Moreover, the identity of the sons of God will be confirmed when the divine presence visibly dwells in their midst (1:25). The restoration of the children of God to the covenant relationship leads to the eschatological goal of new creation (1:29). Finally, the true descendant of Abraham (i.e. Jacob) is designated as God's "first-born son" (19:29). *Jubilees*, then, surrounds the motif of the "sons of God" with the motifs of a holy spirit, law fulfillment, new creation, and Abraham's descendants in a manner with marked similarities to Rom 8 and 9. One significant difference, however, is that *Jubilees* explicitly links the sons of God and the connected web of ideas to God's covenant relationship with Israel.

⁷ Unless otherwise indicated, quotations of *Jubilees* are drawn from James C. VanderKam, *The Book of Jubilees*, 2 vols., CSCO 510-511; Scriptorum Aethiopicorum 87-88 (Leuven: Peeters, 1989). At times the versification of VanderKam's translations differs from Orval Wintermute's translation in *Old Testament Pseudepigrapha*, ed. James H. Charlesworth (Garden City, N.Y.: Doubleday, 1985) 2:35–142. I use VanderKam's versification throughout.

Observing that the motif of “God’s sons” is linked to a similar set of motifs by both *Jubilees* and Romans raises the question of whether these cursory analogies indicate a much deeper set of shared ideas. Do the two authors bring together a similar collocation of motifs around divine sonship because they share certain assumptions about the sons of God? Put another way, since *Jubilees* explicitly relates the collocation of ideas to covenant renewal, could Paul also employ a similar, though implicit, covenantal logic such that the “sons of God” should be understood as “covenant members”? Further, if Paul does operate with a similar conception of the sons of God as found in *Jubilees*, how might reading Romans in conversation with *Jubilees* elucidate the logic of Paul’s argument?

My central thesis is that Paul assumes certain characteristics of the sons of God in the logic of Romans, and that Paul shares similar assumptions with the author of *Jubilees*. In other words, one can detect a narrative substructure underlying Paul’s descriptions of the “sons of God” that demonstrates marked similarities with the narrative of the sons of God in *Jubilees*.⁸ Just as the logic of covenant membership in *Jubilees* holds together the collocation of motifs including divine sonship, the giving of the divine spirit, law fulfillment, new creation, and Abrahamic descent, so an analogous covenantal logic in Romans brings together the same motifs. This does not mean, however, that the two authors bring together the collocation of motifs in the same manner. In fact, reading *Jubilees* and Romans together highlights clear differences in conclusions. Nevertheless, these differences only further serve

⁸ I employ Richard Hays’ concept of a “narrative substructure” in order to surmount the basic methodological problem of identifying narrative elements within Paul’s discursive letter. Richard B. Hays, *The Faith of Jesus Christ: The Narrative Substructure of Galatians 3:1-4:11*, 2nd ed., The Biblical Resource Series (Cambridge, U.K.: W.B. Eerdmans, 2002), 21–29. The concept of a narrative substructure is crucial in a study comparing the theme of divine sonship in two texts from different genres. Hays has convincingly shown that the same narrative substructure underpins the christological formulations in Gal 3:13–14 and 4:3–6 (pgs. 73–116). Hays’ most famous application of analyzing Paul’s narrative substructure is in his argument that the phrase πίστις Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ should be understood as a reference to the “faithfulness of Jesus Christ” (pgs. 163–205). In this regard, Hays is most convincing in his analysis of Gal 2:20; 3:22; Rom 3:21–26.

to illustrate that both Paul and *Jubilees* work with similar assumptions about the sons of God despite their theological differences.

1.1 PAULINE SCHOLARSHIP'S USE OF *JUBILEES*

Many Pauline studies have made use of *Jubilees* as a helpful point of comparison for the motifs of divine sonship, Abrahamic descent, new creation, and the Spirit. Frequently, these studies follow the well-worn path of surveying one of the above motifs in Old Testament texts, tracing it through Second Temple Jewish material, and then applying the results to Paul's letters. To be clear, the review of each of these motifs is not exhaustive but selective of those that engage with *Jubilees*. Yet, scholars seeking to analyze one of the above motifs have found a wealth of comparative material in *Jubilees*. In addition, studies seeking to isolate a single theme, for example, divine sonship, frequently overlap with one or more of the other themes, exposing insights from the juxtaposition without necessarily providing detailed investigation into the reasons for the presence of such themes together in *Jubilees* or discussion of how the interrelationships among those themes bears upon ideas in later texts.

In this section, then, I consider studies that have engaged with *Jubilees* in analyzing the motif of divine sonship or one of those I argue is collocated with it. In addition to describing each study's main contribution, I emphasize two additional points. First, I highlight how *Jubilees* functions in each argument and, second, I pay attention to how studies dedicated to one theme frequently overlap with the other themes. Such a survey demonstrates the need for a study dedicated to the collocation of the themes in Romans and *Jubilees*. In the following, I analyze work concerned with divine sonship first, then subsequently examine studies that survey the themes of new creation, Abrahamic descent, and the Spirit.

1.1.1 PAULINE STUDIES ON DIVINE SONSHIP

Brendan Byrne contextualizes Paul's theme of "God's sons" by tracing divine sonship in Jewish scripture and Second Temple texts.⁹ From his survey of Second Temple material Byrne concludes that 1) sonship is a "privilege of Israel alone" and 2) the epithet was frequently used in eschatological contexts for the "ideal Israel" and linked to "immunity from death."¹⁰ Considering *Jubilees* in particular, Byrne highlights divine sonship's connection to God's eternal presence with his people (*Jub.* 1:22–29), God's election of Israel (*Jub.* 2:19–20), and the notion that God's sons are equated with the patriarchal lineage (*Jub.* 19:27–29).¹¹ The challenge for any study connecting Paul's divine sonship language to a Jewish background is that one of the key terms, υιοθεσία (Gal 4:5; Rom 8:15, 23; 9:4; Eph 1:5), though commonly used in Greco-Roman writing for "adoption," is not found in the LXX tradition or Second Temple Jewish literature.¹² Moreover, the Jewish scriptures do not describe any form of "adoption" law, as can be found in Greco-Roman sources. Nevertheless, Byrne views the Jewish sonship tradition as a ready-made vehicle to describe God's relationship with his people, a tradition which Paul taps into with the word υιοθεσία. Byrne finds key support for his case in Rom 9:4, where Paul includes υιοθεσία in a formal list of

⁹ Byrne, *Sons of God*. Jewish scripture uses the phrase to describe angelic beings (e.g. Gen 6:1–4; Ps 82:6–7), Israel (e.g. Exod 4:22; Hos 2:1), and royal figures (e.g. Pss 2:7; 89:19; 110:3; 2 Sam 7:14). Byrne narrows his focus to human referents, and particularly the community of Israel, arguing that there are no firm textual grounds for equating "angelic sonship of God" to "Israelite sonship of God" in the period (pgs 66–67).

¹⁰ Byrne, *Sons of God*, 62–63.

¹¹ Byrne, *Sons of God*, 30–32.

¹² James Scott's exhaustive study of the lexical evidence has decisively shown that the term should be translated "adoption as son." *Adoption as Sons of God: An Exegetical Investigation into the Background of HUIOTHESIA in the Pauline Corpus*, WUNT II 48 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1992), 55–56. Scott examines the entire semantic field including six word groups: εἰσποιεῖν, ἐκποιεῖν, τίθεσθαι, ποιεῖσθαι, υἱοποιεῖσθαι, and υἱοτετεῖν. Scott's conclusion stands in contrast to the more general concept of "sonship," which was suggested by Byrne, *Sons of God*, 80. For a listing of the evidence, see also *THE VOCABULARY OF THE GREEK TESTAMENT*, s.v. "Υιοθεσία"; *A GREEK-ENGLISH LEXICON*, s.v. "Υιοθεσία."

Israel's privileges, thus aligning his use of the term with the Jewish sonship tradition.¹³ Here Byrne recognizes that Paul's use of υιοθεσία is closely linked to a discussion of the patriarchal lineage in Rom 9:7–8, thus displaying marked similarities to other Jewish authors.¹⁴ In addition, the notion of “immunity from death fits well with υιοθεσία in Rom 8:23 (“we wait for adoption, the redemption of our bodies”), and Byrne argues that the Jewish tradition of a “common fate” shared between creation and the sons of God is represented in Rom 8:19–22.¹⁵ Byrne concludes:

Paul works within Jewish categories, employs Jewish terminology, has recourse to the Jewish basis of proof—Scripture. He may ask his Jewish and judaistic Christian correspondents to turn their theology inside out; he does not require them to embrace a totally new conceptuality or learn a new language.¹⁶

Byrne has provided a thorough survey of sonship texts in the Jewish tradition. This necessary work does not need to be repeated. His eclectic selection of Jewish texts, however, does highlight where further research on Paul's connection to the Jewish sonship tradition can be fruitful. As Byrne himself notes, “What is indeed remarkable is the considerable affinity of Paul's sonship theology with that of a work so early ... as *Jubilees*.”¹⁷ Simply because of the breadth of the study's design, Byrne's summaries lose nuance from the individual sonship texts. A more narrowly focused study on *Jubilees* and Romans allows space to examine the depth of the affinity between the two works; one can then contextualize the sonship texts within each author's broader theology.

¹³ Byrne, *Sons of God*, 84. See my discussion in §5.2.

¹⁴ Byrne, *Sons of God*, 139–140. Byrne does not specifically mention *Jubilees* in this context.

¹⁵ Byrne, *Sons of God*, 104–108.

¹⁶ Byrne, *Sons of God*, 220.

¹⁷ Byrne, *Sons of God*, 220. Cf. also Byrne's comparison of the eschatological assize in Rom 8:31–39 to *Jub.* 1:25; *ibid.*, 122.

James Scott's study of υιοθεσία in Paul agrees with Byrne's in that Paul's metaphor should be contextualized within the Jewish tradition, but Scott argues for a more specific "Adoption Formula" as the background. According to Scott, this "Adoption Formula" originates from 2 Sam 7:14 and can also be detected in *Jubilees*. For Scott, 4QFlor. 1:11 interprets the Davidic messiah's adoption in 2 Sam 7:14a as the focal point for the entire nation's eschatological restoration;¹⁸ *Jub.* 1:24 then extends the formula from the messiah to include the eschatological people of God via new covenant theology; and, finally, *T. Jud.* 24:3 applies the "Adoption Formula" to *both* the messiah and his people. Thus, the messiah is the "*Heilbringer*," whose sonship is extended to the people through an appropriation of the tradition in 2 Sam 7:14a.¹⁹ Scott then argues that the influence of this tradition can be demonstrated in both the future and present aspects of υιοθεσία in Rom 8:15, 23. He begins by suggesting that τοῦ ὀρισθέντος υἱοῦ θεοῦ in Rom 1:4 is a circumlocution of the adoption formula in 2 Sam 7:14a, such that Christ's resurrection by the Holy Spirit declared him the Davidic Son of God.²⁰ Moreover, Christ's resurrection is "prototypical of the future resurrection of the dead" and "those who are in Christ will participate in the resurrection and sonship of the Son by being adopted as sons of God at a Spirit-mediated resurrection."²¹ Thus, Paul draws on the "Adoption Formula" by extending the Davidic Son's privileges to the new covenant "sons of God" in a similar fashion as *Jub.* 1:24. Scott further argues that believers' shared inheritance with Christ in Rom 8:17 should be understood as participation in the "Abrahamic inheritance of universal sovereignty with the Son (Rom. 4:13; 8:17, 32),

¹⁸ Scott works under presupposition that the Exile is "theologized" and that "Israel remained in a state of Exile long after the sixth century, and that it would be brought to an end only when God intervened to establish his rule" (Scott, *Adoption*, 114–115).

¹⁹ Scott, *Adoption*, 116–117.

²⁰ Scott, *Adoption*, 239–240.

²¹ Scott, *Adoption*, 244.

the Firstborn among many brothers (8:29).”²² Finally, Scott argues that the tradition in 2 Sam 7 influenced the present aspect of υιοθεσία in Rom 8:15. The Spirit inspires participation in the earthly Jesus’ “Abba” cry (cf. Mk 14:36) and brings about the fulfillment of the commandments of the law (cf. Ezek 36:26–28).²³

There is much to commend in Scott’s effort to demonstrate how Paul conceived of the Davidic “Son of God” relating to the “sons of God.” Scott rightly insists that 2 Sam 7, *Jub* 1:24, and the Pauline “divine sonship” texts retain a covenantal concept. Considering the divine sonship theme in covenantal terms provides Scott with a suggestive conceptual link between the Spirit-mediated resurrection of the Davidic Son in Rom 1:4 and the same future expectation of the many “sons of God” in Rom 8:11 and 23. Scott is also persuasive in arguing that believers’ inheritance is properly understood when linked to Rom 4:13 as participating in the Abrahamic inheritance of universal sovereignty.

There are, however, problems with Scott’s hypothesis. The primary difficulty is that none of the texts that Scott adduces as part of the 2 Sam 7:14a adoption tradition use the term υιοθεσία or equivalent adoption terms. So, while the link between the tradition and Rom 8:15, 23; 9:4 is possible, it is difficult to establish as *probable*. Byrne rightly critiques Scott’s thesis: “We have only certain texts reiterating the language of the 2 Sam. 7:14 oracle. This may have been understood ‘adoptively,’ but in the absence of more precise language, we remain on the level of surmise.”²⁴ So, while many of his exegetical observations should be

²² Scott, *Adoption*, 266. In support of this conclusion, Scott argues that the inheritance of 8:17 is linked back to Abraham in Rom 4:13 (pgs. 248–252), the inheritance is linked forward to the conformity to the πρωτότοκος of 8:29c (pg. 252), and that the πρωτότοκος is a messianic reference to Ps 89:28 just as Rom 8:34 is to Ps 110 (pg. 255). Thus, according to Scott the Davidic Christ receives the inheritance of Abraham as is the case in Gal 3–4.

²³ Scott, *Adoption*, 259–265.

²⁴ Brendan Byrne, “Review: Adoption as Sons of God,” *J Theol Studies* 44.1 (1993): 288.

retained, Scott's proposal of a specific "Adoption Formula" standing behind Paul's use of υιοθεσία should not.

Before I move on to studies on the inter-related themes with divine sonship, it is important to locate my argument with respect to Byrne and Scott's work. Methodologically, this thesis stands between Byrne's eclectic survey and Scott's specifically defined "Adoption Formula." *Jubilees* and Romans collocate enough of the same motifs to "God's sons" that a more in-depth study is warranted than Byrne provides. This allows space to develop *Jubilees'* theology in its own terms and understood in its own context.²⁵ Yet, I do not presuppose or argue for any type of direct link between the two works. In other words, I am not arguing for a specific background as Scott does. Rather, the study compares and contrasts the assumptions, arguments, and the conclusions of the two works that broadly draw on Jewish sonship traditions rooted in Jewish scripture. Designing the study in this way allows for the contextualization of divine sonship within the broader theology of the works. So, I now turn to studies that analyze one of the interconnected motifs of new creation, Abrahamic sonship, and the giving of the spirit in Paul and *Jubilees*.

1.1.2 STUDIES ON NEW CREATION IN *JUBILEES* AND PAUL

Moyer Hubbard's study of καινή κτίσις in 2 Cor 5:17 and Gal 6:15 argues that the phrase should be understood anthropologically rather than cosmologically.²⁶ That is, "new creation" in these two Pauline passages primarily indicates the transformation of individuals rather than

²⁵ In this respect, I conceive of this study as following the pattern found in Bruce W. Longenecker, *Eschatology and the Covenant: A Comparison of 4 Ezra and Romans 1-11*, JSOT 57 (Sheffield: JSOT, 1991) and Jonathan A. Linebaugh, *God, Grace, and Righteousness in Wisdom of Solomon and Paul's Letter to the Romans: Texts in Conversation*, NovTSup 152 (Leiden: Brill, 2013).

²⁶ Moyer V. Hubbard, *New Creation in Paul's Letters and Thought* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002).

a new world or age. Hubbard makes his case with an “argument about context,” which for Hubbard means to exert more effort contextualizing the “new creation” motif within Paul’s letters rather than primarily focusing on other Jewish literature.²⁷ Nevertheless, before turning to the Pauline letters, Hubbard surveys the phrase and broader motif of “new creation” in biblical prophets (Isaiah, Jeremiah, and Ezekiel) as well as the Second Temple texts of *Jubilees* and *Joseph and Aseneth*. Hubbard categorizes the motif in Isaiah as both anthropological (Isa 40–55) and cosmological (Isa 65–66), while Jeremiah’s image of the law written on the heart and Ezekiel’s new heart/new spirit motifs depict the recreation of individuals from the inside out (ch. 2). For Hubbard, *Joseph and Aseneth* uses new creation to describe individual conversion (ch. 4) and *Jubilees* displays both anthropological and cosmological aspects (ch. 3). In *Jub.* 1:23, Hubbard finds an emphasis on inward renovation: “unlike Jeremiah and Ezekiel, who believed Israel was hardened beyond repentance, the author of *Jubilees* fully expects Israel to amend its ways and rededicate itself to God and Torah.”²⁸ According to Hubbard, however, the emphasis in *Jubilees* falls on the cosmological accent because “the plight is perceived primarily in terms of extrinsic factors, political and demonic opposition, [thus] ... the solution will be similarly conceived: a newly created cosmos.”²⁹

Hubbard provides a helpful comparison of *Jubilees*’ depiction of new creation and Paul’s use of the phrase. Hubbard’s conclusion from *Jubilees* that new creation language should be interpreted within a “restoration and reversal” pattern of thought is strongly

²⁷ Hubbard, *New Creation*, 77, cf. 5–7.

²⁸ Hubbard, *New Creation*, 45.

²⁹ Hubbard, *New Creation*, 53.

supported by *Jub.* 1, as I also argue in §2.2.1.1.³⁰ While the particular nuance of the phrase as either anthropological or cosmological in 2 Cor 5:17 or Gal 6:15 is beyond my purview, Hubbard’s emphasis on the anthropological sense of this restoration enables him to contextualize the “new creation” motif in conjunction with Paul’s death/life symbolism (with a particular attention on Rom 6:1–11 and 7:1–6).³¹ Because of his limited focus on the phrase *καὶνὴ κτίσις*, Hubbard does not extend his discussion into Rom 8. If this is done, however, it can arguably be shown that the theme of divine sonship serves as a bridge from the individually focused life/death motif (Rom 8:1–11) to the restored creation imagery, which is cosmological in orientation (8:18–22). Indeed, Paul brings together anthropology and cosmology in Rom 8:23 when the future anticipation of creation is linked with the future of redeemed individual bodies.

Mark Forman’s study on the concept of “inheritance” in Paul also foregrounds a “new creation” because he understands “inheritance” to entail the physical land as is prevalent in Jewish scripture.³² Building off the work of James Hester, Forman argues that “inheritance,” for Paul, shifts to the eschatological understanding of the “land” as the whole earth, in other words, the new creation.³³ Forman’s project extends this understanding of “inheritance” in a socio-political direction, seeking to show that the motif would be heard as subversive to the Roman Empire.³⁴ In considering Rom 4:13, Forman argues that the inheritance has strong

³⁰ Hubbard, *New Creation*, 50. Hubbard’s openness to reading *Jub.* 1 and 23 not as consecutive but as equivalent events should be rejected (*Ibid.*, 47). I argue this point in §4.2.

³¹ Hubbard, *New Creation*, 77.

³² Mark Forman, *The Politics of Inheritance in Romans* (Cambridge, U.K.: Cambridge University Press, 2011).

³³ Forman, *Politics*, 68–70. Cf. James D Hester, *Paul’s Concept of Inheritance: A Contribution to the Understanding of Heilsgeschichte*, *Scottish Journal of Theology Occasional Papers* 14 (London: Oliver & Boyd, 1968), 82.

³⁴ Forman, *Politics*, 10–11.

political implications because the people of God are described as having universal sovereignty over the renewed earth (ch. 3). Here, Forman argues that the spiritual seed of Abraham (Rom 4:14–18) connects back to the universalized land inheritance of Rom 4:13.³⁵ *Jubilees* plays an important role in the argument. Forman argues that *Jubilees* blends Abraham’s land promise with Adam’s universal sovereignty so that Israel’s inheritance is conceived of as the whole of new creation. In this way, *Jubilees* serves as an important precursor to the concept of a universalized land inheritance.³⁶

In order for Forman’s overall thesis (i.e. Paul’s “inheritance” concept inevitably clashes with Rome) to be convincing, more attention needs to be given to Rom 13:1–7 (“Let every person be subject to the governing authorities ...”) than the brief interaction he offers in his conclusion. Nevertheless, Forman correctly reads the Abrahamic inheritance of Rom 4:13 as a “this-worldly” land promise universalized in a similar way as in *Jubilees*. Moreover, Forman rightly connects the Abrahamic inheritance of Rom 4 to the inheritance that the sons of God share with Christ in Rom 8:17.³⁷ Here, Forman arrives at similar conclusions as found in Scott’s study on adoption. In Forman’s reading of Rom 8:17–39, Paul forges undeniable connections between the motifs of “glory” and “inheritance”: “Paul uses the word ‘glorified’ almost synonymously with κληρονόμος in verse 17 ... ‘Glory,’ for Paul, includes the reflection of God’s radiance, splendor and power through the redemption of κτίσις, the cosmic and this-worldly renewal of all things.”³⁸ I argue that Forman’s observation in Paul can be correlated with *Jubilees*, which not only equates Abraham’s inheritance with renewed

³⁵ Forman, *Politics*, 72–80.

³⁶ Forman, *Politics*, 81–84.

³⁷ I argue this point in §6.2.3.

³⁸ Forman, *Politics*, 115.

creation, but also marks the eschatological culmination with God's visible reign from Mt. Zion (*Jub.* 1:28).

1.1.3 STUDIES ON ABRAHAMIC DESCENT IN *JUBILEES* AND PAUL

In this section I consider studies that examine the nature of Abrahamic descent in *Jubilees* and Paul. The first two studies by Ellen Juhl Christiansen and Matthew Thiessen focus on circumcision, but they belong in this section because of the close links between circumcision, covenant identity, and the descendants of Abraham. Third, I engage with Francis Watson's *Paul and the Hermeneutics of Faith*, with a special focus on the chapters in which Watson analyzes the different interpretations of the Abrahamic narrative in Genesis offered by *Jubilees* and Paul.

In her study informed by social-scientific conceptions of identity, Christiansen suggests that "the characteristic identity features of a group, the basic forms of socio-religious belonging, are mirrored by the entrance rites."³⁹ Christiansen then argues that in Judaism the rite of circumcision designates covenantal belonging and identity, while for Paul the rite of baptism marks entry into the church and social identity. The two groups can be socially differentiated from each other, marking the fundamental break between Christianity and Judaism, because of these two distinct rites of entry.⁴⁰ Within Christiansen's broader thesis, *Jubilees* is described as largely following in continuity with the covenantal consciousness found in the Old Testament, which is defined primarily in nationalistic terms with circumcision affirming this identity.⁴¹ In contrast, Christiansen argues that other Jewish texts,

³⁹ E. Juhl Christiansen, *The Covenant in Judaism and Paul: A Study of Ritual Boundaries as Identity Markers*, AGJU (Leiden: Brill, 1995), 16.

⁴⁰ Christiansen, *The Covenant in Judaism and Paul*, 16, 321.

⁴¹ Christiansen, *The Covenant in Judaism and Paul*, 101.

like the Temple Scroll, narrow covenantal identity such that identity was defined by stricter forms of purity rather than simply national identity.⁴² In her reading of Romans, Christiansen acknowledges that Paul understands covenant as important to Israel's historical privileges and identity categories in Rom 9:4–5. Yet, she maintains that Paul does not use covenant unambiguously to embrace a Christian identity. According to Christiansen, this is because

Paul found covenant as a term inadequate For an ecclesiological identity other terms containing the aspect of sociality are preferred, such as ἐκκλησία τοῦ θεοῦ, or family related terminology, τέκνα θεοῦ, or υἱοθεσία, or ministry related, such as κλητοὶ ἅγιοι, ἀγαπητοὶ θεοῦ. Christian identity is primarily expressed in terms of “belonging to” or “being in” Christ, or “having received” the Spirit, never as being in the covenant.⁴³

It is evident that in Romans Paul does not apply the term “covenant” to the combined Jew and Gentile community. Christiansen's methodological choice to focus on the specific term “covenant” is problematic because its absence does not necessarily mean that Paul does not conceive of the new community as a covenant community.⁴⁴ Christiansen creates a false distinction between covenant language, on the one hand, and “family related terminology,” on the other.⁴⁵ I substantiate the claim that familial language, particularly sonship language, is covenant language in *Jubilees* and Romans throughout this thesis. For now it is sufficient to recognize that Christiansen's focus on Rom 9:4–5, where covenant language is explicit, versus my own choice to include Rom 8, where the concept of a covenant is arguably present, is a significant point of divergence between our two studies. Christiansen provides no rationale as to why υἱοθεσία is used in a list of Israel's privileges in Rom 9:4 but the same

⁴² Christiansen, *The Covenant in Judaism and Paul*, 321–322.

⁴³ Christiansen, *The Covenant in Judaism and Paul*, 271.

⁴⁴ Here I largely agree with Stanley Porter's warning against reliance on a single word in his essay “The Concept of Covenant in Paul,” in *The Concept of the Covenant in the Second Temple Period*, ed. Stanley E. Porter and Jacqueline C. R. De Roo, JSJSup 71 (Leiden: Brill, 2003), 269–85.

⁴⁵ Though beyond the purview of my thesis, this is arguably true of the phrases ἐκκλησία τοῦ θεοῦ, κλητοὶ ἅγιοι, and ἀγαπητοὶ θεοῦ as well.

term carries different connotations in Rom 8:15 and 23 when describing the hope of believers.

Matthew Thiessen's *Paul and the Gentile Problem* sees that a significant impetus in Paul's theology was explaining how Gentiles have become descendants of Abraham. Thus, Thiessen has developed a theory of how Paul conceived of "gentiles-in-Christ" participating in the blessings of Abraham's seed. For Paul, Thiessen argues, Gentiles do not become Abraham's descendants through circumcision or law observance. While Paul has traditionally been understood as critiquing circumcision as legalistic, others have read Paul's criticism as aimed at the nationalistic nature of circumcision.⁴⁶ In contrast to both these views, Thiessen argues that Paul's critiques in Rom 2 and Gal 3 are not directed at Judaism or circumcision, *per se*. Rather, Thiessen's Paul objects specifically to *Gentiles* adopting the Jewish law and undergoing the rite of circumcision.⁴⁷ *Jubilees* is crucial to Thiessen's argument because it provides evidence of a strand of Jewish thought that excluded any form of Gentile conversion. For *Jubilees*, circumcision entailed certain procedural requirements, including that the procedure occur on the eighth day after birth.⁴⁸ Therefore, "Any adult male undergoing circumcision fails to keep the law because he does not do so on the eighth day after he was born."⁴⁹ According to Thiessen, while at one point Paul may have preached Gentile conversion and circumcision (Gal 1:3, 4; 5:11), after Paul's calling he preached a circumcision-free gospel to the Gentiles, in part because he came to understand circumcision

⁴⁶ For one expression of the "New Perspective" understanding of Paul's critique of the law as nationalistic, see James D. G. Dunn, *Romans 1-8*, Word Biblical Commentary 38A (Dallas: Word Books, 1988), lxiii–lxxii.

⁴⁷ Matthew Thiessen, *Paul and the Gentile Problem* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2016), 52–70, esp. 54.

⁴⁸ Thiessen, *Gentile Problem*, 65–67.

⁴⁹ Thiessen, *Gentile Problem*, 68.

in a manner akin to *Jubilees*.⁵⁰ In Thiessen's account, Paul affirms that Gentiles must become sons of Abraham, but, like *Jubilees*, he denies that circumcision is effective for adult Gentiles. In contrast to *Jubilees*' exclusion of Gentiles from the Abrahamic blessings, however, Thiessen's Paul has conceived of an alternate manner through which Gentiles can become part of Abraham's seed.

In Part 2 of his book, Thiessen develops this positive account of how Gentiles relate to Abraham. For Paul, the indwelling *pneuma* of Christ, who is Abraham's seed, is able to relate Gentiles to Abraham's lineage materially. Using a modern analogy, Thiessen compares circumcision to cosmetic surgery while the reception of Christ's *pneuma* performs gene therapy.⁵¹ Gentile inclusion in Abraham's seed is crucial because God made certain promises *only* to Abraham and his seed, including the promise that Abraham's descendants would be like the stars. Thiessen argues that Paul, like other Jewish interpreters, read this promise from Gen 15:5 and 22:17 comparing Abraham's descendants to the stars qualitatively as well as quantitatively. In other words, the reception of the *pneuma* makes Gentiles like the stars in the sense that they will become angelic or divine beings, which many early readers of Jewish scripture believed stars to be.⁵² Finally, Thiessen argues that because Paul's gospel addresses the Gentile genealogical problem with the reception of the *pneuma*, it also addresses the Gentile morality and mortality problem.⁵³

Thiessen's argument is a strong and coherent reading of Paul's description of the Gentile problem. Most significantly, Thiessen has rightly seen that Paul, like *Jubilees*, is

⁵⁰ Thiessen, *Gentile Problem*, 41.

⁵¹ Thiessen, *Gentile Problem*, 15–16. In Thiessen's account, Paul draws on the idea of a material *pneuma* from the Stoics. The *pneuma* is the smallest and finest particle that can permeate other atomic structures. Thus, the *pneuma* of Christ can materially relate Gentiles to Abraham.

⁵² Thiessen, *Gentile Problem*, 16, 132–148.

⁵³ Thiessen, *Gentile Problem*, 148–154.

concerned to show the true identity and nature of Abraham's descendants (e.g. Rom 4:1; 9:6–13; *Jub.* 19). While the context of Paul's quotation of Gen 15:5 in Rom 4:18 ("So shall your descendants be") may emphasize the numerical likeness to the stars rather than the qualitative reading, Thiessen is correct that Paul understands this Abrahamic promise as intimately connected to the gospel (Rom 4:23–25). Thiessen is also correct in pointing out that Paul sees the Gentile's two-sided problem as revolving around morality and mortality (e.g. Rom 6:21), both of which are answered by the gospel for Paul.

I am not persuaded, however, that Thiessen has adequately established his case that Romans is exclusively concerned with the "Gentile problem." Put another way, within the argument of Romans, the problems of morality and mortality are universal and not merely Gentile ones. Likewise, questions can be raised concerning Thiessen's thesis that Romans objects *only* to Gentiles taking on the Jewish law,⁵⁴ but a central objection emerges from Rom 5.⁵⁵ Here, Paul traces the problems of sin and death back to Adam (Rom 5:12–13), and thus describes these as universal problems. In this abbreviated telling of the history of redemption, Paul acknowledges the entrance of the law (Rom 5:13–14), but for Paul the law increased transgression (Rom 5:20), while the Christ event produces righteousness and life (Rom 5:18). In other words, Thiessen's attempt to read Rom 1–4 as a particularly Gentile problem cannot be sustained when one encounters the universal language of Rom 5. Even so, Thiessen convincingly demonstrates how Paul argues for Jew and Gentile inclusion in the seed of Abraham.

⁵⁴ Two examples must suffice for now. First, Rom 2:12 and 3:19 describe those who have the law and those who do not as equally under God's judgment, namely, Jews who appropriately possess the law and Gentiles who do not are under condemnation. Second, while Galatians is addressed to Gentiles seeking to take on the Jewish law and circumcision (i.e. Gentiles *judaizing*), one cannot simply assume the same problem is addressed in Romans as Thiessen appears to do. Romans 11:17–24 warns Gentile believers against boasting over their Jewish brethren, not against taking on circumcision as in Gal 5:2.

⁵⁵ According to Thiessen's index of ancient sources, he has not dealt with any verses from Rom 5:12–21 in this book; Thiessen, *Gentile Problem*, 293.

Francis Watson’s study, *Paul and the Hermeneutics of Faith*, compares Paul’s scriptural interpretation with other early Jewish interpretations of the same texts. Within this larger study, Watson analyzes the different readings given by Paul and *Jubilees* of the Abrahamic narrative in Genesis.⁵⁶ Watson provides a methodological precursor for this study in creating three-way conversations between Paul, non-Christian Jewish interpreters, and Jewish scripture.⁵⁷ For Watson, Paul’s enduring Jewish identity is visible through his “critical dialogue with other Jews about a common heritage and identity,” namely, Paul and his fellow-Jews were readers of the same scriptural texts, the Torah and the prophets.⁵⁸ Watson’s basic hypothesis is that

Engagement with scripture is fundamental to Pauline and non-Christian Jewish theological construction, and that those ‘early Jewish’ texts, Christian or otherwise, can therefore be located within a single intertextual field—not in spite of their interpretive differences, but precisely because of them.⁵⁹

This method applied to *Jubilees*’ and Paul’s reading of Abraham proves fruitful. For Watson, Paul’s is a radically theocentric reading of the Abrahamic narrative, with the patriarch primarily depicted as one who receives divine promises.⁶⁰ Accordingly, Watson argues that Paul understands Gen 15:6 as crucial, or from Watson’s perspective, as the hermeneutical key to reading the rest of the Paul’s Abrahamic narrative,⁶¹ where Abraham had a moment of

⁵⁶ Francis Watson, *Paul and the Hermeneutics of Faith*, Second Edition. (London: Bloomsbury T&T Clark, 2016).

⁵⁷ Watson, *Hermeneutics*, 2–5.

⁵⁸ Watson, *Hermeneutics*, 1. See also Macaskill’s suggestion concerning the diversity with Judaism “that ownership of the stories of Israel is, to a significant extent *the* central point of conflict and that covenantal themes dominate the issues, however they are to be resolved” Grant Macaskill, *Union with Christ in the New Testament* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2014), 103. Emphasis original.

⁵⁹ Watson, *Hermeneutics*, 5.

⁶⁰ Watson, *Hermeneutics*, 168.

⁶¹ Watson, *Hermeneutics*, 158–159.

decision (i.e. he believed God) in which the reckoning of righteousness is pronounced.⁶²

Jubilees, which stands in contrast to Paul's account for Watson, produces an anthropocentric reading of Abraham with Gen 22:1 ("After these things God tested Abraham") as the hermeneutical key (*Jub.* 17:15–18). *Jubilees* highlights the twin motifs of Abraham's testing and responding faithfulness (*Jub.* 13).⁶³ Watson has shown that, while Paul and *Jubilees* come to divergent conclusions, the two authors are linked through the shared heritage of the Jewish scriptures.

One of Watson's most fascinating discoveries is that both Paul and *Jubilees* recognize the same problem of election contained within the narrative of the Pentateuch: "if the commands are fundamental and foundational for the life of the chosen people, how is it that this people could come into being without them?" In other words, how is it that the elect people of God begin with Abraham long before the giving of the law at Mount Sinai?⁶⁴ Part of the point of *Jubilees*' rewriting of Genesis is to show more clearly that the law already existed at the time of Abraham and was observed by the patriarchs.⁶⁵ In like manner, Paul was struck by the belatedness of the institution of circumcision in the Pentateuch, even for Abraham (Rom 4:10; cf. Gen 17:2). This textual phenomenon was not a point of embarrassment for Paul, but an opportunity to show the relative insignificance of circumcision.⁶⁶

⁶² Watson, *Hermeneutics*, 163–165.

⁶³ Watson, *Hermeneutics*, 203–209.

⁶⁴ Watson, *Hermeneutics*, 216. See also ch. 8 from James L. Kugel, *A Walk through Jubilees: Studies in the Book of Jubilees and the World of Its Creation*, JSJSup v. 156 (Leiden: Brill, 2012).

⁶⁵ Watson, *Hermeneutics*, 217–218.

⁶⁶ Watson, *Hermeneutics*, 196.

While I cannot engage with all facets of Watson's project, his overall thesis that Paul uses careful readings of Jewish scripture to build his theological constructs is firmly supported by his analysis the Abrahamic narrative. That Paul recognizes the tension built into the Pentateuch (i.e., How can the patriarchs represent the origins of God's chosen people long before the giving of the law on Sinai?) demonstrates his attention to the text. Just as important for my thesis, Watson has shown that Paul and *Jubilees* can properly be brought into conversation on the topic of Abraham and his descendants. While they come to conclusions tailored to and specific to their historical frames and situations, both Paul and *Jubilees* wrestle with the same textual phenomenon.⁶⁷

In addition, Watson's analysis of different readings of the Abrahamic narrative has direct bearing on this study because both Paul and *Jubilees* link the sons of God with the descendants of Abraham (*Jub.* 19:26–29; Rom 9:7–8). My study, however, has a significant methodological difference from Watson's. Watson brings Paul's interpretation of specific texts, such as Gen 15:6, Lev 18:5, and Hab 2:4, into a three-way conversation with the biblical texts cited and other early Jewish interpretations of the same text. My focus on the divine sonship of believers in Paul requires that I look at more than just scriptural citation. Indeed, as mentioned above, one of the key terms Paul uses, υἱοθεσία, is not found in any known Septuagint (LXX) tradition of which I am aware. Nevertheless, at the heart of this study is the contention that divine sonship in Romans constitutes a Pauline retrieval of a concept from Jewish scripture even in the absence of specific citations.

⁶⁷ Watson, *Hermeneutics*, 482.

1.1.4 STUDIES ON THE SPIRIT IN *JUBILEES* AND ROMANS

To this point, I have considered previous research on divine sonship, Abrahamic descent, and new creation in Paul and *Jubilees*. To close the literature review, I examine Rodrigo J.

Morales's study of the significance of the Spirit in Gal 3–4.⁶⁸ Morales's overall thesis is that there is a wide tradition in Jewish scripture and Second Temple literature in which the coming of the Spirit marks the restoration or redemption of Israel.⁶⁹ Within this tradition, Morales demonstrates that the giving of the Spirit ends Israel's punishment of exile and brings about the restoration, which is variously described in terms of new creation, new Exodus, the fatherhood of God, peace and righteousness, or resurrection.⁷⁰ In his reading of *Jubilees*, Morales understands the "holy spirit" in *Jub.* 1:23 as a reference to the "purification of the human spirit or a change in the disposition of the recipients to obey the commandments since nowhere in the passage does the author refer to God's Spirit."⁷¹ Noting the context of *Jub.* 1 as the restoration of Israel, Morales concludes, "This new spirit repairs the Israelites' hardened heart and brings them into a filial relationship of righteousness with the God of Israel."⁷² Morales then interprets the Spirit as the eschatological fulfillment of God's promises understood in the light of the Christ event. So, for example, Morales interprets the "curse of the law" in Gal 3:10 as Israel's exile from Deut 27–30 reconceived as the curse of

⁶⁸ Rodrigo J. Morales, *The Spirit and the Restoration of Israel: New Exodus and New Creation Motifs in Galatians*, WUNT 2 282 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2010).

⁶⁹ In the OT: Isa 11:1–16; 32:15–20; 42:1–9; 48:16; 57:14–21; 59:15b–21; 61:1–11; 63:7–64:12; Ezek 11:14–21; 18:30–32; 36:16–38; 37:1–14; Joel 2:18–3:5. From Second Temple literature, Morales examines *Jubilees*, *The Treatise on the Two Spirits*, *The Words of the Luminaries*, *Psalms of Solomon*, *The Similitudes of Enoch*; *The Testament of Judah*, *The Testament of Levi*.

⁷⁰ Morales, *Spirit and the Restoration*, 44–45; cf. 35–38.

⁷¹ Morales, *Spirit and the Restoration*, 47.

⁷² Morales, *Spirit and the Restoration*, 48.

death in light of Christ's death and resurrection.⁷³ Thus, when Paul uses the language of life and death rather than exile and return, he nevertheless is thinking in terms of restoration eschatology.⁷⁴ Or, when Paul describes the Spirit of the Son being sent into "our hearts" in Gal 4:1–7, Morales argues this should be understood as the remedy to the "heart problem" described in Deuteronomy, Isaiah, and Ezekiel that brings about the restoration of Israel.⁷⁵

Morales makes an important and persuasive case that the pouring out of the Spirit in Jewish scripture and Second Temple literature often signifies the restoration of Israel pictured with various images. Moreover, he has correctly identified *Jubilees* as an important example of the phenomenon. Morales' view on the restoration of Israel resonates with the position of other scholars as they collectively establish a link between individual transformations and the instantiation of the new creation, linking personal experience to the wider cosmological restoration. Specifically, Morales's focus on the "spirit" and Hubbard's separate focus on "new creation" both highlight the connection between individual transformation in *Jub.* 1:23 and a wider cosmological restoration in *Jub.* 1:27–29. Moreover, these works on *Jubilees* and the restoration of Israel have particular import for my argument as I claim that Paul connects the life/death contrast with the creation/new creation imagery through the metaphor of "adoption."

1.2 OUTLINE OF THE THESIS

As one can see from this survey, *Jubilees* provides a wealth of comparative material for Pauline scholars studying divine sonship, Abrahamic descent, new creation, or the giving of

⁷³ Morales, *Spirit and the Restoration*, 79.

⁷⁴ Morales, *Spirit and the Restoration*, 166.

⁷⁵ Morales, *Spirit and the Restoration*, 166–167.

the Spirit. This research has generally followed the tried-and-true method of isolating one theme across a wide range of texts from Jewish scripture, Second Temple literature, and, finally, Paul's letters. Analyzing a single theme is a productive exercise. In so doing, these studies frequently draw from the rich and programmatic passages found in *Jub.* 1. Somewhat predictably, then, researchers analyzing one theme inevitably overlap with one or more of the other themes because they are intertwined in *Jubilees*, Paul's letters, or both. For example, Morales's analysis of the Spirit connects to the creation of God's sons and new creation. In Forman's research, Abraham's inheritance is essentially synonymous with new creation. Discussions of inheritance naturally connect with the proper heirs. Both Byrne and Scott have shown that the "sons of God" in both *Jubilees* and Romans overlap with the "seed of Abraham."

If scholars have found helpful comparative material in *Jubilees* for each individual motif, then a study of the collocation of the same themes in *Jubilees* and Romans is also a fruitful exercise. This study will develop the theme of divine sonship and demonstrate how Abrahamic descent, new creation, and the giving of a "new spirit" are linked within *Jubilees*' larger theological concerns. In the second half of the thesis, I seek to demonstrate that Paul makes analogous assumptions concerning the sons of God, even when he comes to contrasting conclusions. Thus, the thesis develops in two parts, the first allowing space for *Jubilees* to be understood in its own terms and the second facilitating a conversation with Romans. The conclusion, as noted, is an argument for a particular covenantal relationship expressed in *Jubilees* that implicitly informs Paul's crafting of Romans and his development of "sonship." Paul brings together similar motifs in a similar way. In particular, the category of sonship functions for Paul, as in *Jubilees*, to identify and legitimate those who can and will enjoy God's presence. Put simply, both texts relate Spirit and the divine presence to

cosmological restoration in a similar way and likely do so precisely because of the broader logic of covenant membership, resulting in a similar story about the purpose and becoming of a new creation *through sonship*. Ultimately, showing how the motifs present in *Jubilees* play out once again in Romans deepens a study of Romans and, specifically, offers one way, rooted in a focused explication of two similar texts, to demonstrate the significance and structure of Paul's "sonship" theology.

In chapter 2, I introduce various issues surrounding the study of *Jubilees*, including genre, dating, composition, and major themes. Then I examine the three major divine sonship passages in *Jubilees* (1:22–29; 2:19–20; 19:29) arguing that the category of "God's sons" is used to designate those who are chosen for covenantal relationship with God. These texts serve to anchor Israel's divine sonship in the beginning, middle, and end of history, and thus support *Jubilees'* conflation of the various biblical covenants into a single, eternal covenant. Within this larger theological concern, one can see that *Jubilees* assumes that Israel's divine sonship is inextricably linked to Abraham's descendants.

In chapter 3, I examine the nature of Israel's election to the covenant in *Jubilees*, arguing that its election to this special status is built into the spatial-temporal realities of the cosmos. The intricate calendrical system synchronized Israel's worship with the heavenly worship carried out by the highest levels of angels, while Israel's land inheritance of the holiest locations on the earth entitled them to the biblical locations where God's presence had been revealed. Further, the elect are fundamentally marked out as recipients of the divine revelation that instructs the covenant people how to fulfill properly their role within the ontological realities of sacred time and space. When Israel fulfilled its priestly role within sacred time and space, the nation enjoyed the divine presence. Finally, I examine how the

author of *Jubilees* demonstrates the relationship between Israel's election to covenant relationship and the people's moral character.

In chapter 4, I demonstrate how this understanding of divine sonship as election to covenant relationship is inextricably linked to the author's eschatology. *Jubilees* views the restoration of the covenant people as the triggering event that eventually will culminate in the restoration of all creation. In other words, Israel's restoration to the covenant serves as the fulcrum point for the history of the world standing between creation and new creation. The influence of the sons of God over the entire created order is in accordance with their elect status built into the created order. It is, therefore, precisely Israel's status as the covenant people, that is, the sons of God, that links their fate with the fate of the entire cosmos. The covenant serves as the crucial link between anthropology and cosmology.

In chapter 5, I work through the occurrences of divine sonship language in Rom 9 and argue that Paul deploys the category similarly to *Jubilees* in that God's sons are covenant members. Israel's adoption (υιοθεσία) in Rom 9:4 should be understood as Israel's entrance into the Sinai covenant because the privilege of adoption is linked to the "giving of the law" (ἡ νομοθεσία) by the structure of the list of privileges. The second occurrence of God's sons in Rom 9:8 also demonstrates overlap with *Jubilees* because Paul here assumes that the children of God are equivalently designated as the "seed of Abraham." Nevertheless, Paul strikingly distinguishes between Israel's adoption marked by the law in Rom 9:4 and the children of God according the Abrahamic promise in Rom 9:7–8. In other words, Paul decouples the Abrahamic covenant from the Sinai covenant in a manner directly contrary to the argument of *Jubilees*.

In chapter 6, I argue that the use of divine sonship in Rom 9 retrospectively supports understanding "God's sons" in Rom 8 as a covenantal category. The primary contention in

the chapter is that the motifs of a divinely given Spirit, renewed creation, and Abrahamic descent are linked with God's sons. For Paul, the Spirit marks the shift in the salvation historical era from the "old written code" to the "newness of the Spirit" (Rom 7:5–6). Thus, the sons of God in Rom 8:12–17 are those who participate in the era of the Spirit, being marked by internal circumcision (Rom 2:29) and law fulfillment (Rom 8:4). In Rom 8:18–30, the restoration of the created order is linked to the revelation of the sons of God and their glorification. Further, the inheritance of the sons of God should be understood as entailing both God's self-given presence as well as the Abrahamic promises (Rom 4:13). In other words, Paul has described the sons of God in Romans with similar motifs used in *Jubilees* to mark out the members of the covenant.

THE ETERNAL COVENANT AND DIVINE SONSHIP IN *JUBILEES*

There are three divine sonship texts in *Jubilees*: 1:22–29; 2:20; 19:18–29. The purpose of this chapter is to situate the divine sonship texts within the broader context of *Jubilees*. *Jubilees* is a rewriting of the biblical narrative from Genesis to the first portion of Exodus, that is, from creation to the covenant ratification on Mt. Sinai. In contrast to Genesis' opening creation accounts, *Jubilees* begins with Moses on Mt. Sinai the day after the covenant has been concluded, when Moses is to receive the “the law and the commandment” and “the law and the testimony” (*Jub.* 1:1, 4). The Lord relays to Moses Israel's future history of sin, exile, and restoration and, in *Jub.* 1:26, the Lord commands Moses to record all the words dictated by the angel of the presence:

What is first and what is last and what is to come during all the divisions of time which are in the law and which are in the testimony and in the weeks of their jubilees until eternity—until the time when I descend and live with them throughout all the ages of eternity.

Within this narrative setting, the author places his retelling of Genesis and Exodus in the mouth of the angel of the presence as he relates information found in the heavenly tablets (*Jub.* 1:27–29). The author articulates a theology in which Israel's covenant relationship is established with God at creation and will extend into the culmination of history. I argue that when the references to divine sonship are properly contextualized within *Jubilees*' covenant theology, one can see that these relatively infrequent references to God's sons are disproportionately significant to the book as a whole.

Before turning to the material on divine sonship, however, I set out important introductory issues pertaining to *Jubilees*. In particular, I explain what is meant when *Jubilees* is identified as “rewritten Bible,” arguing that it is a manner of applying an authoritative text to contemporary issues with an interpretation that is equal in authority to the text itself. Significantly, *Jubilees* also contains literary characteristics of Jewish apocalypses, thus making the work something of a hybrid of both genres. I then consider the date and setting of composition and the possibility of redactional layers. Here I set out reasons why it is probable that the form of *Jubilees* we have today existed by roughly the end of the 2nd c. B.C.E., demonstrating that *Jubilees*’ final form long predated Paul’s writing of Romans.¹ Next, I describe the purpose and major theological themes of *Jubilees*, including the calendrical system, pre-existence of the law, Jew-Gentile separation, and the priesthood. With the broader context of *Jubilees* set, I then examine each of the three divine sonship passages in turn, arguing that the author uses the epithet to designate those chosen for covenant relationship with God. Finally, because the filial language designates covenant members, I finish the chapter by describing *Jubilees*’ broader covenantal theology.

2.1 INTRODUCTORY ISSUES FOR *JUBILEES*

One familiar with the Pentateuch would easily be able to recognize the contours of the biblical material from Genesis and Exodus that *Jubilees* follows. As a result, scholars

¹ The extant manuscripts which contain *Jubilees* in full are of an Ethiopic translation. It serves as the base for VanderKam’s translation. For the full discussion of the manuscripts, see VanderKam, *The Book of Jubilees*, vi–xxxii. The Hebrew fragments attesting to *Jubilees* have been collected and edited in James C. VanderKam and J.T. Milik, “Jubilees,” in *Qumran Cave 4: Parabiblical Texts Part 1*, ed. Harold W. Attridge et al., vol. 13 of (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1994), 1–177. There are a series of Greek and Syriac citations from or allusions to *Jubilees*; however, VanderKam did not find this useful in preparing his own critical edition. Finally, the fifth or sixth century uncial manuscript Ambrosiana C73 Inf. contains about a third of the text in Latin; however, because the manuscript is a palimpsest, portions are difficult to read. Todd Hanneken’s Jubilees Palimpsest Project (<http://palimpsest.stmarytx.edu>) is working to recover the Latin text.

frequently apply the term “rewritten Bible” to the work. Because there is discussion concerning the phrase “rewritten Bible” as either a loose descriptor or a defined genre,² I lay out briefly why the term is appropriate for *Jubilees* and what I mean when I employ it. The author is not intending to replace Genesis and Exodus as an authoritative text, contrary to some scholars.³ Rather, the author intends for *Jubilees* to exist alongside these earlier authoritative writings, though perhaps standing with these prior texts on an equal authoritative footing. This is evident by noting that the rewriting of Genesis and Exodus is not exhaustive but actually assumes knowledge of the complete forms of the earlier texts.⁴ Further, Hindy Najman has advanced two other arguments that *Jubilees* was intended to coexist with the biblical texts.⁵ First, *Jubilees* twice refers to a “first Torah,” which probably refers to the Mosaic Torah.⁶ Second, the author expends much creative energy attempting to reconcile apparent discrepancies or embarrassing elements that arise in Genesis and Exodus.⁷ This apologetic impulse of the author suggests a high regard for the earlier texts. Thus,

² Brooke cites Geza Vermes as an example of the latter and George Nickelsburg as an example of the former. “Rewritten Bible,” *Encyclopedia of the Dead Sea Scrolls*.

³ E.g., Ben Zion Wacholder, “Jubilees as the Super Canon: Torah-Admonition versus Torah-Commandment,” in *Legal Texts and Legal Issues: Proceedings of the Second Meeting of the International Organization for Qumran Studies, Cambridge 1995 : Published in Honour of Joseph M. Baumgarten*, ed. M. J. Bernstein, Florentino García Martínez, and John Kampen (Leiden: Brill, 1997), 195–211.

⁴ E.g., the rewriting of the creation story does not include humanity being made in God’s image; however, in *Jub.* 6:8, a rewriting of Gen. 9:6, the justification for capital punishment for murder is the assumed understanding that humanity was created in God’s image as in the Genesis text.

⁵ Hindy Najman, *Seconding Sinai: The Development of Mosaic Discourse in Second Temple Judaism*, JSJSup 77 (Leiden: Brill, 2002), 43–50.

⁶ *Jub.* 6:20–22; 30:12. I will examine these passages in more detail in the following chapter.

⁷ E.g., Genesis contains stories in which the patriarchs clearly violate a stipulation in the Mosaic Torah and are not punished in the proper manner. The author of *Jubilees* feels compelled to provide an apology for the Pentateuch’s stories of Judah and Tamar (Gen 38 in *Jub.* 41:27–28) and Reuben and Bilhah (Gen 35:22 in *Jub.* 33:13–17). For further discussion, Gary A. Anderson, “The Status of the Torah Before Sinai: The Retelling of the Bible in the Damascus Covenant and the Book of Jubilees,” *DSD*.1 (1994): 1–29.

Jubilees as a rewriting of the biblical narrative should not be conceived as a replacement for Genesis and Exodus.

The author's motivation is not merely to resolve tensions in biblical material, however. The author asserts a particular interpretation of Genesis and Exodus for contemporary circumstances by adding editorial comments, assimilating exegetical traditions and sources, and omitting portions of the biblical source material. As Michael Segal rightly observes, "there are new components in *Jubilees* that did not arise from a difficulty in the reading of the Bible (exegesis), but rather reflect the beliefs and ideas that have been imposed on the biblical stories (eisegesis)."⁸ Rewritten Bible is distinct from a commentary in which the biblical material is clearly distinguished from the interpretive comments. George Brooke's definition of rewritten Bible applies well to *Jubilees*: "any representation of an authoritative scriptural text that implicitly incorporates interpretive elements, large or small, in the retelling itself."⁹ Because the interpretive elements are *implicit*, the interpretation is invested with the same level of authority as the biblical material. As Segal observes of *Jubilees*, "once the rewriter integrated his thoughts within the Torah itself, they became part of the accepted and authoritative collection of beliefs and ideas."¹⁰

It is important to note here, however, an important nuance to the genre in which *Jubilees* is placed. While the work clearly should be categorized as "rewritten Bible,"

⁸ Michael Segal, *The Book of Jubilees: Rewritten Bible, Redaction, Ideology and Theology*, JSJSup 117 (Leiden: Brill, 2007), 4–5. Halpern-Amaru describes rewritten Bible as an "exegetical medium for reinterpretation" that "reveals some sense of the historical circumstances that motivate the rewriting", *Rewriting the Bible: Land and Covenant in Post-Biblical Jewish Literature* (Valley Forge, Pa: Trinity Press International, 1994), 4–5. Najman conceives of *Jubilees*' rewriting as responding "to both the demand for interpretation and the demand for a demonstration of authority," *Seconding Sinai*, 45.

⁹ Brooke, "Rewritten Bible," 77.

¹⁰ Segal, *Jubilees*, 5.

Jubilees bears many of the literary features that would identify it as a Jewish apocalypse. The key statement on the genre of apocalypses is found in John J. Collins' article in *Semina* 14:

“Apocalypse” is a genre of revelatory literature within a narrative framework, in which a revelation is mediated by an otherworldly being to a human recipient, disclosing a transcendent reality which is both temporal, insofar as it envisages eschatological salvation, and spatial in so far as it involves another, supernatural world.¹¹

The narrative framework of the angel of the presence giving the law to Moses on Sinai fits within Collins' genre outline. This angelic mediator is disclosing information from the heavenly tablets concerning the ages of the earth, particularly the culmination of history marked by God's visible presence ruling from Zion. By the elements listed in *Semina* 14, *Jubilees* is an apocalypse.¹²

2.1.1 – DATE OF COMPOSITION AND REDACTIONAL THEORIES

What, then, was the context in which the author of *Jubilees* was rewriting portions of the Pentateuch? The dating of *Jubilees* and, therefore, the setting of its composition have been disputed, though most place it somewhere in the 2nd c. B.C.E.¹³ James VanderKam's position is most persuasive. Holding that *Jubilees* was composed between 161–150 B.C.E., VanderKam builds his case on the following evidence.¹⁴ The earliest extant manuscript of *Jubilees*, 4Q216, dates to 125–100 B.C.E. based on paleographic evidence, and it provides the latest fixed point in which *Jubilees* can be dated.¹⁵ For the earliest terminus, VanderKam

¹¹ John J. Collins, “Introduction: Towards the Morphology of a Genre,” *Semina* 14 (1979): 9.

¹² This last point is significant for the on-going discussion of so called “apocalyptic” elements in Paul's theology. This thesis provides detailed comparative work between Paul and a Jewish apocalypse.

¹³ For a recent, more detailed survey of the opinions, Segal, *Jubilees*, 35–41.

¹⁴ James C. VanderKam, “The Origins and Purpose of the Book of Jubilees,” in *Studies in the Book of Jubilees*, ed. Matthias Albani, Jörg Frey, and Armin Lange, TSAJ 65 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1997), 19–20.

¹⁵ VanderKam and Milik, “Jubilees,” 2.

argues that *Jub.* 4:16–25 demonstrates awareness of the *Book of Dreams* (1 *En* 83–90), which was written no later than about 164 B.C.E. While it appears the passage in *Jubilees* may be summarizing the *Book of Dreams*, the parallels are too general to be conclusive.¹⁶ Finally, VanderKam thinks it likely that *Jubilees* was written before the founding of the Qumran settlement, which he places in the 140's B.C.E.

Other scholars point out the marked absence of any reference to Antiochus Epiphanes or his decrees (167 B.C.E.), an observation that problematizes the earlier portions of the date-range proposed by VanderKam if *Jubilees* was written so soon after the traumatic events. This has caused some scholars to suggest a date of composition before Antiochus,¹⁷ while others see this as an indication the uproar over Antiochus had passed.¹⁸ Arbitrating this question of dating largely depends on the targets of *Jubilees*' polemics, particularly in *Jub.* 23:9–32. If the author is understood to be warning against Hellenizing, a pre-Antiochus date is preferred. If, however, the author was more concerned with inner-Jewish Halakhic debate, then a post-Antiochus date is preferred.¹⁹ Thus, assigning a more exact range requires discussing *Jubilees*' precise relationship to Enochic literature and the sectarian writings of the Qumran community, as well as an appropriate social setting. These questions, however, are beyond the purview of this thesis and greater precision in dating *Jubilees* is not necessary. The composition of *Jubilees* can be safely placed around the middle of the 2nd c. B.C.E.

Scholars have developed redactional theories describing the literary history of *Jubilees* after its initial composition. The basis for these theories is a number of

¹⁶ Segal, *Jubilees*, 36.

¹⁷ Jonathan A. Goldstein, "The Date of the Book of Jubilees," *AAJR* 50 (1983): 63–86.

¹⁸ Segal, *Jubilees*, 319–321.

¹⁹ Segal, *Jubilees*, 320.

inconsistencies and tensions that exist in the final form of *Jubilees*. One inconsistency will suffice as an example of the others.²⁰ In *Jub.* 4:21 the author appears to be drawing from an earlier Enochic tradition that presupposes the length of a jubilee as 50 years instead of 49 years, as in the rest of *Jubilees*. With the importance of exact chronology displayed throughout, it is difficult to imagine that a single author could make such a blatant mistake in a major theme.²¹ Michael Segal and James Kugel have proposed literary development theories to explain the discrepancies within *Jubilees*.²² Segal distinguishes three genres within *Jubilees* (rewritten stories, chronological framework, and legal passages). He then argues that the chronological sections and legal passages generally agree, while the contradictions are located within the rewritten stories. Thus, Segal seeks the final redactor's more or less consistent contribution in the chronological and legal sections.²³ Kugel, building from Segal's work, has identified 29 passages based on distinct terminology that were added into the original work of *Jubilees* by a final redactor, whom Kugel refers to as "the Interpolator."²⁴ According to Kugel, the original version of *Jubilees* traced various laws from Mount Sinai to actions of the patriarchs recorded in the Pentateuch. Thus, the original version of *Jubilees*

²⁰For more complete lists of the alleged contradictions, see *ibid.*, 14–26. and James L. Kugel, *A Walk through Jubilees: Studies in the Book of Jubilees and the World of Its Creation*, JSJSup v. 156 (Leiden: Brill, 2012), 227–84.

²¹Devorah Dimant, "The Biography of Enoch and the Books of Enoch," *VT* 33 (1983): 21. This is based on Gen 5:21–23, which divides Enoch's life into the first 65 years followed by 300 years of walking with God. *Jubilees* records this second segment as "six jubilees of years" (i.e. 6 jubilees x 50 yrs. = 300 yrs.).

²²Segal, *Jubilees*; Kugel, *A Walk*, 207–296. Gene L. Davenport argued earlier for three redactional layers based on different eschatologies held in *The Eschatology of the Book of Jubilees* (Leiden: Brill, 1971). Few scholars have followed Davenport's theory, however. In particular, Davenport employed unpersuasive categories such as apocalyptic and prophetic eschatologies to distinguish layers of redaction (pg. 73). I will interact more extensively with Davenport's proposal when attempting to synthesize *Jubilees* eschatological vision in ch. 4.

²³Segal, *Jubilees*, 21–35.

²⁴Kugel lists "ordained and written in the Heavenly Tablets," "written and ordained," "written and inscribed," having the angel of the presence turn to address Moses directly, "not temporal limits," or "eternal generations." For Kugel, these constitute the "signature" of the Interpolator. *A Walk*, 11–12.

could have been misconstrued so that the divine law was predicated upon human choices. This was unacceptable for Kugel's Interpolator. The Interpolator's additions asserted that "the laws and practices that the original author seemed to attribute to humans were actually divine in origin and execution. The human role was illusory."²⁵ Thus, the heavenly tablets present a useful tool for the Interpolator to show that, while it may appear that the human actions of the patriarchs established the future laws of Sinai, actually they had been divinely inscribed long before.²⁶

For my purposes, the pre-history of the composition of *Jubilees* is not as significant as the final form of the text. The significant question for my thesis is if the final form of *Jubilees* predates Paul. In this regard, it is significant to note that both Segal and Kugel's theories place the activities of *Jubilees*' final redactor in the 2nd c. B.C.E. For Segal, the author composed *Jubilees* sometime after the edicts of Antiochus Epiphanes in a context of inner-Jewish halakhic disputes over calendar (*Jub.* 6:34) and circumcision (*Jub.* 15:25–34).²⁷ Similarly, Kugel notes the similarities between his Interpolator's ideology and that found in the Qumran sectarian texts, for example, parallels in elements of the sabbath law (*Jub.* 2:29–30 and CD 10:22–11:9). Significantly, 4Q216, dated paleographically between 125–100 B.C.E., already contains the Interpolator's sabbath law, thus leading Kugel to place the Interpolator as a Qumran predecessor.²⁸ The important point is that both theories place the final form of *Jubilees* in the 2nd c. B.C.E.

²⁵ Kugel, *A Walk*, 213.

²⁶ Kugel, *A Walk*, 217. For example, Kugel draws out the examples, among others, of the Festival of Tabernacles (*Jub.* 16:20–27) and the Day of Atonement (*Jub.* 34:12–19) on pgs. 207–209.

²⁷ Segal, *Jubilees*, 319–322. Segal notes the overlap in interests with those found in the Qumran sectarian documents, but he backs away from identifying the two.

²⁸ Kugel, *A Walk*, 289–294.

Moreover, given that Ethiopic manuscripts of *Jubilees* were preserved and transmitted by the Abyssinian Church, it is remarkable that there is no detection of “Christian” interpolations. To the contrary, much of the ideology starkly contrasts with the New Testament, not least with Paul’s letters.²⁹ Thus, I find that the ideology of *Jubilees*, including any purported interpolator, fits best within the climate of the 2nd c. B.C.E. and gives us a glimpse into a particular presentation of a Jewish worldview more than a century before the Apostle Paul.

2.1.2 – THE PURPOSE AND THEOLOGICAL THEMES OF *JUBILEES*

The author of *Jubilees* has reworked and altered the biblical material from creation to Sinai in order to communicate *the proper manner* of interpreting Israel’s history. *Jubilees* opens, not with the creation story of Gen 1, but instead with Moses on Mt. Sinai receiving *both* “the law and the commandment” and “the law and the testimony” (*Jub.* 1:1, 4), thus setting the interpretive framework for the primeval and patriarchal rewriting. The “law and the testimony,” which I argue below is *The Book of Jubilees* itself, will serve as a witness of God’s faithfulness in remaining present with Israel despite the nation’s sin, exile, and restoration (*Jub.* 1:6). With this sweeping prediction of Israel’s coming history, the author proceeds to rewrite the biblical narrative of creation, Enoch, Noah, the patriarchs, and the Exodus in such a way that the motif of the covenant emerges in a prominent and distinctive way (e.g. *Jub.* 1:10, 22–25; 23:19–20). The rewriting of the biblical narrative from creation to Sinai shows how the narrative’s proper interpretation, according to the author, demonstrates that God chose Israel as his covenant people at creation, long before Sinai, and that the

²⁹ For example, *Jubilees*’ emphasis on the Sabbath and holy days, circumcision, the preexistence of the Torah before Sinai, and the emphasis on the tribe of Levi.

covenantal relationship will exist into the eschaton. Hence, the author's purpose in composing the work is captured well in *Jub.* 1:6:

So it will be that when all of these things befall them they will recognize that I have been more faithful than they in all their judgments and in all their actions. They will recognize that I have indeed been with them.³⁰

The covenantal motif in *Jubilees* is employed to reassert the privileged status of Israel over the nations—despite the present circumstances—and to call for covenant fidelity from the people.

In order to maintain this position, the author was forced to argue against the inescapable evidence of Israel's history and the Jews' present circumstance: *Is Israel still the covenant people of God if the curses for breaking the Sinai Covenant have been clearly experienced? Can it still be maintained that Israel is God's elect covenant people in the face of the destruction of Jerusalem and the Temple and the exile?* The author answers these questions in the affirmative. As Kugel states, "*Jubilees'* author readily accepted that Israel had sinned and was punished—but this hardly spelled the end of its historic bond with its God. Israel was, and always had been, God's own people."³¹ Why, then, did the people of Israel experience the covenantal curse of exile? For the author, it was because Israel failed to observe the Torah *in the proper way*. The author of *Jubilees* takes the instances of pre-Sinai Torah keeping as an opportunity to demonstrate the proper way to keep the Torah.³² A rough

³⁰ So also, William K. Gilders, "The Concept of Covenant in Jubilees," in *Enoch and the Mosaic Torah: The Evidence of Jubilees*, ed. Gabriele Boccaccini and Giovanni Ibba (Grand Rapids, Mich.: Eerdmans, 2009), 180.

³¹ Kugel, *A Walk*, 6. Similarly, Moyer V. Hubbard describes the purpose of *Jubilees*: "to offer hope to the present generation of Israelites enduring the crisis of foreign domination and political turmoil" *New Creation*, 28.

³² VanderKam suggests that one of the aims of *Jubilees* was to counter a Jewish sect that desired re-assimilation into the Gentile world through the abrogation of the Torah (cf. 1 Macc. 1:11), "The Origins and Purpose," 19–22. This contention accounts for *Jubilees'* view of the eternal nature of the law: if the sect wished to go back to the time Jews were not segregated from Gentiles, then *Jubilees'* counter was that such a time never existed because the Torah has always existed to separate Israel. While this proposal explains the impulse against

pattern emerges in which a patriarch's observance of a law or festival is recounted, followed by an assertion that this manner of law keeping has been recorded on the heavenly tablets. Then, Moses is admonished to command the Israelites to do the same, often with an added prediction that Israel will in fact not remember the command.³³

To support this thesis that Israel remains in covenantal relationship with God, the author constructs and interrelates four overarching theological themes: 1) the chronological structure and solar calendar; 2) the existence of elements of the Mosaic law before Sinai; 3) the separation of the chosen people from impure Gentiles; and 4) the emphasis on the priestly line of Levi.³⁴

First, the chronological system of *Jubilees*, the book's most prominent feature, is heptadic in nature with the following units of years: a week (7 years), a jubilee (49 years), and a jubilee of jubilees (2450 years). The events of Genesis and Exodus are dated from the time of creation by the week and jubilee.³⁵ Israel's exodus and entry into the land is situated at the jubilee of jubilees, so that, while the jubilee of Lev 25 dealt with the release of individual slaves and return of inheritance, the jubilee of jubilees was the divine release of the nation as slaves and the return of Israel's inheritance (*Jub.* 50:4).³⁶ The structure and order of

Hellenistic assimilation, it does not adequately account for the inner-Jewish halakhic polemics contained in *Jubilees*.

³³ For example, the sabbath (*Jub.* 2:19–33; 50:1–13) and circumcision (*Jub.* 15:23–32).

³⁴ In the following, I roughly follow the categories put forward by VanderKam, "The Origins and Purpose," 16–19. I also work with Segal's description of four themes, *Jubilees*, 5–11; however, while he includes 'angelology' as a category, I have chosen to subsume *Jubilees*' angelology under Israel's election (*Jub.* 15:31–32) and their inheritance of the priestly line (*Jub.* 10:8–14).

³⁵ E.g. Eve gave birth to Cain "in the third week in the second jubilee" (4:1), i.e. between years 64–70. The original title is not known, but CD 16:3–4 refers to the work as "The Book of the Divisions Times according to their Jubilees and in their 'Weeks.'" The Ethiopic manuscripts contain a similar title with the additional phrase "according to the Torah and to the Testimony" inserted after "Divisions of Times," Kugel, *A Walk*, 2.

³⁶ VanderKam, "The Origins and Purpose," 17.

the events of history serve as an indication of God's providence over history, and thus ensures that the eschatological vision in *Jub.* 1 will also occur at its appointed time.³⁷

Moreover, *Jubilees* specifies that the calendrical year be measured as a solar year, each with exactly 364 days and 52 weeks (*Jub.* 6:23–38). The reason for this level of precision is to ensure that the festivals on earth will correspond with the heavenly tablets, and so also the heavenly cult. Despite the gift of the heavenly calendar, the angel tells Moses that the Israelites will “err regarding the months, the sabbaths, the festivals, and the jubilee” (*Jub.* 6:37b), and therefore incur the covenant curses.

Second, *Jubilees* asserts the existence of Mosaic laws long before Sinai by pairing certain Pentateuchal laws with the patriarchal narratives. While the narration in Genesis contains relatively few legal texts, the author of *Jubilees* tends to work legal material into the narrative at opportune moments, demonstrating not only the existence of the laws but also that the patriarchs were Torah observant. For example, after recording God's blessing of Noah, Genesis 9:4–5 contains a prohibition against consuming blood. The author of *Jubilees* records this blessing of Noah and prohibition, then includes a lengthy legal addition to the biblical material instructing Moses and the children of Israel on their own covenant and corresponding prohibition concerning consuming blood (*Jub.* 6:11–14). The author's insistence on Israel's special relationship with God since creation necessitates the existence of the laws as well, because the stipulations are part and parcel of the covenant. Segal

³⁷ Segal comments about the author's worldview that “the world functions according to predetermined periods of time, at the end of which it returns to its original state,” *Jubilees*, 8. Kugel, slightly more speculatively, suggests that the chronological structure of the book is to give the recipients a larger perspective: “If only one could step back and view history not in terms of tens or even hundreds of years but still larger units, one would recognize the hand of God behind all the apparently chaotic ups-and-downs...,” *A Walk*, 9.

comments: “if Israel is indeed the Lord’s ‘[special people]’ from the time of creation, then their requirement to observe the commandments was also in force from that time as well.”³⁸

Third, *Jubilees* places a strong divide between Israel as the elect people of God and the impurities caused by Gentiles. This emphasis can be clearly seen in *Jubilees*’ rewriting of the story of Dinah and the Shechemites in *Jub.* 30. The author uses the story of Simeon and Levi’s slaughter of the Shechemites in Gen 34 as an opportunity to rail against Israelite intermarriage with Gentiles. A father who gives his daughter to a foreigner is equated to one who gives his child to Molech, and an Israelite woman who marries a foreigner is equated to a harlot (*Jub.* 30:5–10; cf. Lev 18:21; 21:9). The punishment reserved for a priest’s daughter who commits fornication in Lev 21:9 is extended to any Israelite daughter who marries a foreigner in *Jub.* 30:7.³⁹ Moreover, giving an Israelite daughter to a Gentile has ramifications for the whole nation. It is a reproach to the nation (*Jub.* 30:13), and even if one woman is given to a Gentile, “then the entire nation will be condemned together because of all this impurity and this contamination” (*Jub.* 30:13).

Fourth and following from the previous point, *Jubilees* demonstrates a clear tendency to highlight the priesthood and particularly the line of Levi. The pre-Sinai patriarchs are depicted as conducting priestly activities (Adam, *Jub.* 3:27; Enoch, *Jub.* 4:26; Noah, *Jub.* 6:1–4; etc.). Out of all of Jacob’s blessings on his sons, Judah and Levi stand out as the more prominent figures, with Levi taking priority even amongst these elite two (*Jub.* 31:12–17). Levi is marked out, along with the earlier priestly line, by his inheritance of all his father’s

³⁸ *Jubilees*, 7. See also VanderKam, “The Origins and Purpose,” 18. The connection between election to covenantal relationship and the existence of law is especially clear with the introduction of the sabbath in *Jub.* 2:19–21, as we will discuss further below.

³⁹ John C. Endres, *Biblical Interpretation in the Book of Jubilees*, CBQMS 18 (Washington, DC: Catholic Biblical Association of America, 1987), 140.

books.⁴⁰ Part of the information contained in these priestly books concerned medicines that freed Israel from the power of Mastema and his spirits (*Jub.* 10:8–14; cf. 1:20).

2.2 THE ETERNAL COVENANT AND DIVINE SONSHIP

With the overall purpose and theological emphases of *Jubilees* in place, I can now consider the role of divine sonship in the context of the wider argument for Israel's permanent privileged status. In the remainder of this chapter, I show that divine sonship is used in *Jubilees* to designate those who are chosen for covenantal relationship with God and, moreover, to anchor Israel's sonship in the beginning, middle, and end of history. Once the covenantal nature of divine sonship is established, the way will be opened to exploring *Jubilees*' distinctive conception of the covenant.

2.2.1 DIVINE SONSHIP TEXTS

Modern scholarship has established a close connection between sonship language and covenant in the Jewish scriptures. Concerning the origins of the connection, F.M. Cross has demonstrated that, for West Semitic tribal groups like Israel, "kinship relations defined the rights and obligations, the duties, status, and privileges of tribal members, and kinship terminology provided the only language for expressing legal, political, and religious institutions."⁴¹ In other words, the language of the familial unit was used to describe the results of the legal connection between non-familial units, that is, covenant relationships.⁴²

⁴⁰ This is a motif we will explore thoroughly in the chapter on election in *Jubilees*.

⁴¹ F. M. Cross, "Kinship and Covenant in Ancient Israel," in *From Epic to Canon: History and Literature in Ancient Israel* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1998), 1.

⁴² A striking example is found in 1 Kgs 5:14–26 MT (1 Kgs 5:1–18 NRSV), where Hiram, king of Tyre, renews with Solomon the covenant held with David; Hiram is labeled a "lover of David" (cf. Amos 1:9). Cross, "Kinship," 10.

The fictive kinship between tribes was further extended to the divine, so that, according to Cross, Israel as “the people of God” should be understood as “the kinsmen of God.”⁴³ The connection between sonship and divine covenant appears in Exod 4:22–23:

Then you [Moses] shall say to Pharaoh, “Thus says the LORD: Israel is my firstborn son. I said to you, ‘Let my son go that he may worship me.’ But you refused to let him go; now I will kill your firstborn son.”

In the narrative up to Israel’s foundational events of the exodus and Sinai covenant, God is situated so that he describes his relationship to Israel with father-son terminology. Noting the connection between sonship and covenant in this passage, Denis McCarthy concludes that the two are inseparable and nearly synonymous.⁴⁴ It is worth noting for my later discussion on *Jubilees* that Christopher Wright nuances McCarthy’s conclusion by distinguishing between sonship and covenant so that Israel’s sonship connotes their *relationship* with God, which existed before (cf. Exod 4:22) and after (cf. Jer 31:9) the covenant of Sinai.⁴⁵

The connection that these modern commentators highlight between sonship and covenant, plus the further nuance distinguishing a filial and covenant relationship, helpfully illustrate one of *Jubilees*’ concerns. *Jubilees* has rewritten the biblical texts so that Wright’s distinction between sonship (or relationship) and the concept of covenant cannot be maintained. For *Jubilees*, as I argue in this section, Israel’s sonship becomes synonymous with Israel’s covenant relationship complete with the stipulations, blessings, and curses of the covenant. By an examination of the three key sonship texts, *Jub.* 1:24–28; 2:20; and 19:18–29, I demonstrate that sonship and primogeniture serve to identify the community chosen for covenant membership. While covenant is ubiquitous in *Jubilees*, divine sonship language is

⁴³ Cross, “Kinship,” 12.

⁴⁴ Dennis J. McCarthy, “Israel, My First-Born Son,” *The Way*.5 (1965): 191.

⁴⁵ Christopher J. H. Wright, *God’s People in God’s Land: Family, Land and Property in the Old Testament* (Exeter, England: Paternoster, 1990), 21.

relatively sparse. Nevertheless, sonship occurs in key passages such that the importance of the concept is disproportionate to the number of occurrences. By making use of texts from the Jewish scripture in particular ways, the author exploits the divine sonship language in order to establish the continuous nature of God's covenantal relationship with Israel. For *Jubilees*, Israel's filial relationship to God—and, therefore, the covenant—is established at creation, present at the restoration, and affirmed in the eschaton. Thus, while the connection between sonship and covenant is not new to *Jubilees*, the author employs the motif to support his argument that the single covenant between God and his people has been established at creation and will extend into the eschaton. It is true, the author of *Jubilees* would concede, that Israel has experienced the covenant curses. Yet, God will be more faithful than his people, and he will restore Israel in such a way that they will indeed finally be able to fulfill the covenant's stipulations.

2.2.1.1 *Children of God at the Restoration and New Creation: Jubilees 1:24–25, 28*

Jubilees 1 presents the entire history of Israel as essentially covenantal in structure following the sin, exile, and restoration pattern. The writing of the law and the testimony will stand as a witness to Israel of God's faithfulness when their predicted fate befalls them (*Jub.* 1:4–6).

Drawing from a patchwork of biblical passages, especially Deut 31, the author describes Israel's satisfaction upon entering the land, the people's descent into sin, and ultimately their exile (*Jub.* 1:7–14). Yet, the people will return to God with “all their minds, all their souls, and all their strength” so that God will restore Israel with the Temple, his presence, and covenant relationship (*Jub.* 1:15–18). Moses, distraught at the prediction, unsuccessfully attempts to intercede on behalf of the people (*Jub.* 1:19–21),⁴⁶ though the Lord again

⁴⁶ An intercession modeled after Exod 32:11–14; Deut 9:25–29, Davenport, *Eschatology*, 26.

reiterates the future restoration that will follow full repentance (*Jub.* 1:22–25). The chapter closes with a statement of the scope of history covered in the writings given to Moses: from creation to the eschaton. The culmination of the events recorded is marked by God’s descent to live with Israel (*Jub.* 1:26), God’s appearance and reign from Mt. Zion (*Jub.* 1:27–28), and the making of the new creation and temple on Zion (*Jub.* 1:29).⁴⁷

Within the broader covenantal pattern of *Jub.* 1, there are two references to divine sonship that serve to establish the covenantal relationship at the restoration of the covenant and in the eschaton. The first of these comes on the tail end of the second description of the restoration in *Jub.* 1:22–25. Once the people have returned to God in a fully upright manner with all their minds and souls, God’s response is described with three “I will” statements followed by the ramifications for the people. First, God will cut away the foreskins of their minds (cf. Deut 10:16; 30:6), presumably to free them from their contrary nature, way of thinking, and stubbornness.⁴⁸ Second, God will create for them a “holy spirit” and purify the people. This new spirit and purity result in a moral and ethical enabling to fulfill the law: Israel will never again turn away from the Lord, they will cling to his commandments, and, indeed, this spirit enables Israel to perform God’s commandments (cf. Ezek. 36:26–27).

The third “I will” statement from the Lord contains the divine sonship language in *Jub.* 1:24c–25:

I will become their father and they will become sons to me. All of them will be called sons of the living God. Every angel and every spirit will know them. They will know

⁴⁷ I note that there is some debate whether vv. 26–28 describe the divine presence filling the eschatological Temple (i.e. in the author’s future) or the filling of the tabernacle as described in Exod 40 (i.e. in the author’s distant past), e.g. Kugel, *A Walk*, 25–28; Todd R. Hanneken, *The Subversion of the Apocalypses in the Book of Jubilees* (Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2012), 174–180. I engage Hanneken’s reading in §4.2.1 while discussing the eschatology of *Jubilees*.

⁴⁸ Kugel, *A Walk*, 25; Davenport, *Eschatology*, 27. On the relationship of divine intervention and human repentance in *Jub.* 1, David Lambert, “Did Israel Believe That Redemption Awaited Its Repentance? The Case of Jubilees 1,” *CBQ* 68 (2006): 631–50. Hubbard contrasts *Jubilees*’ optimism concerning Israel’s ability to repent with the pessimism of Jeremiah and Ezekiel; *New Creation*, 45.

that they are my sons and that I am their father in a just and proper way and that I love them.⁴⁹

The declaration of God’s father-child relationship with Israel is immediately supported by a clear allusion to Hos 1:10.⁵⁰ The author emphasizes that angelic and spiritual beings will acknowledge and recognize the identity of the sons of God and their relationship with the Lord. The author, then, has combined three restoration passages—Deut 30:6, Ezek 36:26–27, and Hos 1:10—in order to show that his community has the opportunity to be the generation that experiences the renewing of the covenant. God will remove the tendency to be unfaithful and at the same time enable the community to maintain the covenant stipulations of the Torah. The end result is that Israel will enjoy the chief covenantal benefit of experiencing a loving father-son relationship with God.

For *Jubilees*, however, the time of the restoration cannot be conflated with the eschatological expectation. From the perspective of the author, though the restoration was a future expectation, it is not necessarily thought of as simultaneous to the new creation.⁵¹ Hence, the declaration of Israel’s sonship at the restoration is not the same as sonship in new

⁴⁹ In this quotation, I have replaced VanderKam’s gender inclusive language of “children” with Wintermute’s translation as “sons.” I have consistently made this change where appropriate in citations of *Jubilees*. There are no extant Hebrew witnesses to the word used in the verse. The Ethiopic term *welud* is the plural form for son, child, boy, lad according to Thomas Oden Lambdin, *Introduction to Classical Ethiopic* (*Ge‘ez*), HSS 24 (Missoula, Mont.: Scholars Press, 1978), 442. *Jub.* 1:25a is a clear reference to Hos 1:10 (see the following note). The equivalent verse in the MT (2:1) uses the plural construction of בָּנִים, which has a similar lexical range as *welud*, including son, boy, child, youth (*BDB*: 119–122). The LXX tradition uses the more gender specific language of υἱός for Hos 2:1 LXX. While I acknowledge the importance of gender inclusive language, retaining the gender specific “sons” is important to the overall argument examining divine sonship.

⁵⁰ Hosea 1:10b (2:1 in MT): “and in the place where it was said to them, ‘You are not my people,’ it shall be said to them, ‘Children of the living God.’”

⁵¹ I argue this point more extensively in §4.2.2. For now we note Scott’s observation that *Jubilees* has a “rigorous temporal symmetry” such that the gradual decline of creation and humanity into decay will be mirrored by the gradual reversal of the state after people return to the right way, *On Earth as in Heaven: The Restoration of Sacred Time and Sacred Space in the Book of Jubilees*, JSJSup 91 (Leiden: Brill, 2005), 212–217. This is especially clear in *Jub.* 23 with reference to human lifespan.

creation. It is significant to note, then, that the identification of the restoration generation as “[sons] of the living God” in 1:24–25 is matched by the second sonship text in 1:28:

The Lord will appear in the sight of all, and all will know that I am the God of Israel, the father of all Jacob’s children, and the king on Mt. Zion for the ages of eternity. Then Zion and Jerusalem will become holy.⁵²

Once again the author emphasizes that the sons of God will be acknowledged as such. In v. 28, however, this recognition is “in the sight of all” rather than by “every angel and every spirit” as in v. 25. The moment of recognition that the Lord is “father of all Jacob’s children” is coordinated with the Lord’s appearance in the sight of all, the rebuilding of the Temple, and God reigning from Mt. Zion. Thus, the identity of God’s sons is closely linked to those who experience the presence of God. In this sense, the reference to divine sonship in *Jub.* 1:28 is the eschatological culmination of Israel’s divine sonship declared at the restoration in *Jub.* 1:24–25.

2.2.1.2 Firstborn of God at Creation: Exodus 4:22 in Jubilees 2:20

The first week of creation is rewritten by the author of *Jubilees* in such a way that the primary focus is on the sabbath. Indeed, the entire creation story is framed by the sabbath (*Jub.* 2:1, 17–18), and the lengthy additions to the Genesis material concern the sabbath and its relation to Israel. The observance of the sabbath indicates a special relationship with God himself. According to *Jubilees*, Israel was initiated into this unique relationship with God during the very week of creation. In *Jub.* 2:19–22, Israel is said to be separated, sanctified, blessed, and chosen as those who will keep the sabbath along with their heavenly counterparts. This language of election is linked with the covenant formula, “They will become my people and I

⁵² 4Q216 contains some of the text of *Jub.* 1:26–28 in Hebrew (*DJD* 13, 11–12), though the Hebrew term underlying “children” is missing.

will become their God.” According to *Jub.* 2:23, just as the sabbath followed 22 previous creations and was sanctified and chosen, so also Jacob followed 22 previous leaders of humanity and he was sanctified and chosen. As van Ruiten concludes, “The choice of Israel is built into the creation. The setting apart of Israel from the other nations is a component of the creation events.”⁵³

The significant point for my argument is that the emphasis on election and covenant during the week of creation is described as a father-son relationship by the author. In *Jub.* 2:19–20, the angel of the presence relates what God spoke to him and the other holiest angels:

He said to us: “I will now separate a people for myself from among my nations. They, too, will keep sabbath. I will sanctify the people for myself and will bless them as I sanctified the sabbath day. I will sanctify them for myself; in this way I will bless them. They will become my people and I will become their God. I have chosen the descendants of Jacob among all of those whom I have seen. I have recorded them as my first-born son and have sanctified them for myself throughout the ages of eternity.”⁵⁴

The description of Israel as God's firstborn is not common in Jewish scriptures, occurring only twice.⁵⁵ The first is in *Exod* 4:22—cited earlier—where God calls Israel, his firstborn, out of Egypt. The second is in *Jer* 31:9, in which God's reason for restoring Israel is that he is Israel's father and Ephraim is his firstborn. In examining these passages, van Ruiten concludes that *Jubilees* refers to a broader tradition and not one text, because the specific formulation of *Jub.* 2:20b does not occur anywhere in the Jewish scriptures.⁵⁶ Surely *Jubilees* draws from *Exod* 4:22, *Jer* 31:9, or both, since they are the only places that refer to Israel as

⁵³ Jacques T.A.G.M. van Ruiten, *Primaeval History Interpreted: The Rewriting of Genesis 1–11 in the Book of Jubilees*, JSJSup 66 (Leiden: Brill, 2000), 49. Segal concurs, *Jubilees*, 258.

⁵⁴ 4Q216 contains some of the text of *Jub.* 2:13–24 in Hebrew (*DJD* 13, 19–24), though, unfortunately, the reference to the “firstborn” is a reconstruction.

⁵⁵ *Ps* 89:28 MT possibly speaks of the Davidide as God's firstborn, though this is clearly royal in nature.

⁵⁶ van Ruiten, *Primaeval*, 61.

God's "firstborn." Further, because Exod 4:22 assumes that Israel is God's firstborn even before the exodus event, this particular text fits best with *Jub.* 2:20b. As Kugel points out, Exod 4:22 presented a particular interpretative challenge: if Israel was already the firstborn before the Exodus, when did they become God's son?⁵⁷ Particularly in the case of *Jubilees*, if Jacob was the 23rd in the line of the leaders of humanity, how could he and his descendants be conceived of as the firstborn? *Jubilees* answers this question by locating the origin of Israel's sonship within the week of creation. According to Kugel, "God thought about the seed of Jacob in connection with the very first Sabbath, long before Jacob, Israel's progenitor, even existed."⁵⁸

This passage reveals an important assumption for *Jubilees*. If Israel has been chosen as the covenant people since the beginning of creation, then covenant stipulations have also existed since the beginning of creation. Segal correctly infers from this passage the following:

In line with this biblical notion of covenant, the election of Israel was meaningless without stipulations to the covenant, without commandments. If Israel was indeed a chosen nation from the first week of creation, then there was a need for laws from that same moment.⁵⁹

Thus, Israel was given the sabbath from the moment of its election to covenantal relationship in the first week of creation. This is the logic the text follows: because Israel is chosen as firstborn son, God will inform them of the sabbath; when Israel keeps the sabbath, they will be blessed. The blessing that is received is again defined by the covenant formula in *Jub.* 2:19: "They will become my people and I will become their God."⁶⁰ Moreover, the curse of death was established for those who defiled the sabbath (*Jub.* 2:25c). In this way the author of

⁵⁷ James L. Kugel, "4Q369 'Prayer of Enosh' and Ancient Biblical Interpretation," *DSD* 2 (1998): 123.

⁵⁸ Kugel, *A Walk*, 33.

⁵⁹ Segal, *Jubilees*, 281.

⁶⁰ van Ruiten, *Primaeval*, 59–60.

Jubilees has combined Exod 4:22 and the creation sabbath in order to establish that all of the elements of the covenant have existed since creation: election, stipulation, blessing and cursing. Van Ruiten helpfully rewords the covenant-stipulation connection in father-son terms: “[t]he conception of Israel as a ‘first-born son’ should be seen as an expression of the special relationship between God and Israel ... He loves his son, and he demands obedience.”⁶¹ As long as Israel has been God’s son, there have been commandments from the father to obey.

Jubilees does not conceive of the covenant stipulations only as legal demands. The sabbath is a blessing that marks out the relational connection with the divine. The two great classes of angels, the angels of the presence and the angels of holiness,⁶² have observed the sabbath *with* God in heaven and on earth (*Jub.* 2:18). So when the sabbath is extended to Israel, they celebrate it not only with the elite classes of angels but with God himself (*Jub.* 2:19, 21). In addition to the sabbath, the Festival of Weeks was also celebrated in heaven since creation (*Jub.* 6:17–18). The angels of the presence and the angels of holiness were created circumcised and the rite was extended to Israel so that they could be with God and the holiest angels (*Jub.* 15:27). Thus, to observe the sabbath, the Festival of Weeks, or circumcision on earth is to imitate the divine and angelic in heaven. The obedience of the firstborn, Israel, connected them to their father’s presence.

2.2.1.3 – *Abraham’s Blessing of Jacob*: *Jubilees* 19:18–29

The third divine sonship text occurs in the extensive expansion to the narrative of Genesis containing Abraham’s blessing of Jacob. Rather than having Abraham’s death before the birth of Jacob and Esau (cf. Gen. 25:1–11; 25:21–26), *Jubilees* narrates the story so that

⁶¹ van Ruiten, *Primaeval*, 61.

⁶² These two classes of angels are in distinction from the angels associated with nature (cf. *Jub.* 2:2).

Abraham favored and blessed Jacob after observing the behavior of his grandsons. The author of *Jubilees* relates the incident in two direct speeches (*Jub.* 19:18–25, 27–29) separated by the narration of Abraham kissing and blessing Jacob (*Jub.* 19:26). Abraham directs his first speech to Rebecca and the second to Jacob. The section culminates in *Jub.* 19:29: “May the Lord God become your father and you his first-born son and people for all time.”

In van Ruiten’s detailed analysis of this text, he has very helpfully uncovered parallels between the blessings contained in Abraham’s speech to Rebecca and to Jacob, respectively.⁶³ Because of their importance, the parallels van Ruiten finds are reproduced in full here:

18a	A	For I know that the Lord will choose him for himself as a people noteworthy from all who are on the surface on the earth.
23	B	May all my blessings with which the Lord blessed me and my descendants belong to Jacob and his descendants for all time.
24	C	Through his descendants may my name and the name of my ancestors Shem, Noah, Enoch, Malaleel, Enos, Seth, and Adam be blessed.
25	D	Above the firmament
27a	D'	Above the firmament
27b	C'	May he give you all the blessings with which he blessed Adam, Enoch, Noah, and Shem.
27c	B'	Everything that he said to me and everything that he promised to give me may he attach to you and your descendants until eternity
29a b	A'	May the Lord God become your father and you his first-born son and people for all time.

In view of the parallels between A and A', van Ruiten’s measured conclusion is that “the election of Jacob as God’s own noteworthy people is in fact described in terms of the father-son relationship and Jacob’s primogeniture.”⁶⁴

⁶³ Jacques T.A.G.M. van Ruiten, *Abraham in the Book of Jubilees: The Rewriting of Genesis 11:26-25:10 in the Book of Jubilees 11:14-23:8*, JSJSup 161 (Leiden: Brill, 2012), 244–50.

⁶⁴ van Ruiten, *Abraham*, 248.

The particular nexus van Ruiten has identified between election and sonship can be filled out more completely by bringing in the notion of covenant, despite the absence of the term. Jacob is to receive the blessings that were passed through the lineage from Adam to Shem (C, C') and most recently received by Abraham himself (B, B'). The specific blessings given to Jacob included those that were associated with God's covenant promises to Abraham (vv. 23, 27b). Similarly to the Genesis account, Jacob will be a blessing to the earth and his descendants will be as innumerable as the sand of the earth (v. 22). Unique to *Jubilees*' rewriting of the Abrahamic covenant blessings, Jacob's descendants will fill the *whole* earth (v. 21) and will be able to resist the power of Mastema (v. 28). The blessings that Jacob receives as a result of his election are the same blessings that his grandfather received through his covenant with God. In this way, the author of *Jubilees* draws together election to the covenant and the patriarchal lineage in his use of firstborn and sonship language. The special relationship enjoyed by Israel with God should be explicitly labeled a covenant relationship.

This claim finds further support when, before his death, Abraham prays that God would renew his covenant with Jacob (*Jub.* 22:15). It is important to highlight, however, that Jacob is not merely renewing God's covenant *with Abraham*. He is actually participating in the same covenant that was started with Noah in the past and will be extended to Moses and Israel in the future. In other words, for *Jubilees*, Abraham and Jacob are participating in the single, eternal covenant relationship with God rather than one distinct from the other biblical covenants. This last claim will be further substantiated as I turn towards a description of the covenant found more broadly in *Jubilees*. For now it should be noted that the descendants of Abraham is a designation that essentially overlaps with the category of the sons of God for *Jubilees* because both categories designate covenant members.

2.2.2 THE COVENANT BEYOND THE SONSHIP TEXTS

By an examination of the three divine sonship passages in *Jubilees*, I have established that the concept of sonship is used by the author to designate those who are chosen for covenantal relationship with God. The way is open now to explore *Jubilees*' particular conception of God's covenantal relationship with his people beyond the main sonship texts.

For the author of *Jubilees*, the concept of covenant corresponds roughly with the biblical covenants found in the Pentateuch. Covenants ratified in *Jubilees* are agreements between two parties marked by particular ceremonies (e.g. *Jub.* 14:1–20, cf. Gen 15:1–21) in which both sides possess obligations. On the divine side, God offers various benefits such as giving the land as an inheritance, fertility, military success, and general prosperity. The chief privilege is the presence of God (*Jub.* 1:6), particularly captured in the formula “they will be my people and I will become their God” (*Jub.* 2:19). With regard to additional blessings, *Jubilees* further describes Israel and the earlier patriarchal line as receiving protection from evil spirits (10:8–14), worship paralleling the angelic cult (2:26–28), and the forgiveness of sins (5:13–19). On the human side, certain stipulations are given more prominence such as circumcision (*Jub.* 15:11–14), prohibitions against consuming blood (*Jub.* 6:10, 11–14), and adherence to the proper calendar (*Jub.* 6:17–22).⁶⁵

The concept of the covenant, however, comes much more to the fore in *Jubilees* than in the biblical material it rewrites. As discussed above, *Jub.* 1 sets the interpretive framework for the entire primeval and patriarchal period within the covenantal pattern of sin, exile, and restoration. VanderKam correctly comments that *Jubilees* is a “covenantal book in its

⁶⁵ Jacques T.A.G.M. van Ruiten, “The Covenant of Noah in Jubilees 6.1–38,” in *The Concept of the Covenant in the Second Temple Period*, ed. Stanley E. Porter and Jacqueline C. R. De Roo, JSJSup 71 (Leiden: Brill, 2003), 170.

structure and in its content.”⁶⁶ In the following, I explore how the author achieves this new emphasis in his rewriting. First, I look at how the author reshapes the multiple covenants in Genesis and Exodus into a single, eternal covenant that is continually renewed. Second, in regard to the crucial phrase “law and testimony,” the author appears to be describing how the course of world history is mapped out in accordance with the covenant.

2.2.2.1 *The One, Eternal Covenant of Jubilees*

As I argued above, *Jubilees* designates Israel as covenant members, that is, sons of God, from creation to new creation. One implication of *Jubilees*’ presentation is that Israel’s covenant existed with God long before Mt. Sinai. The biblical material, however, presents the reader with a series of covenants between God and humanity, starting with Noah, then the patriarchs, and finally Moses and Israel on Sinai. In this section, I demonstrate that *Jubilees* portrays the various biblical covenants as expressions of the single covenant that is continually renewed on the 15th day of the third month.

In *Jub.* 6:11, the angel of the presence explicitly cites the covenant with Noah as the grounds for the Mosaic covenant. After reporting the making of Noah’s covenant, the angel turns to Moses in direct speech, saying:

For this reason he told you, too, to make a covenant—accompanied by an oath—with the Israelites during this [third] month on the mountain and to sprinkle blood on them because of all the words of the covenant which the Lord was making with them for all times. (*Jub.* 6:11)

The Noahic covenant serves as the direct basis for the Mosaic covenant recorded in Exodus 24, where Moses sprinkled the blood of the covenant on the people of Israel. The biblical Noahic and Sinai covenants are already linked by the shared elements of “covenant” and

⁶⁶ James C. VanderKam, “Covenant and Biblical Interpretation in Jubilees 6,” in *The Dead Sea Scrolls Fifty Years after Their Discovery: Proceedings of the Jerusalem Congress, July 20-25, 1997*, ed. Lawrence H. Schiffman et al. (Jerusalem: Israel Exploration Society, 2000), 92.

blood prohibitions. Yet, van Ruiten argues that the author has strengthened the ties by interchanging elements between the Sinai and Noahic covenants.⁶⁷ First, while the Noahic covenant is a one-sided gift and promise in Gen 9:8–11, *Jubilees* has rewritten the passage so that Noah and his sons take an oath before God and with each other not to consume blood (*Jub.* 6:4, 10). Van Ruiten suggests this horizontal element originates in the Sinai Covenant.⁶⁸ Second, *Jubilees* introduces into the Noahic covenant the concept of blood presented at the altar to make atonement, a concept from the Sinai event (*Jub.* 6:2, 14; cf. Lev 17:11).⁶⁹ In a similar study, Halpern-Amaru shows that elements from the Abrahamic blessings are found in *Jubilees*' account of Noah (*Jub.* 6:5), and Noah is found in the account of Abraham (*Jub.* 19:24, 27; 21:10; 22:13). She concludes, “[c]learly the author of *Jubilees* wishes to establish a close, if not singular, relationship between the Noahite, patriarchal, and Israelite covenants.”⁷⁰

The author of *Jubilees* tightens the link between the biblical covenants further by investing new meaning into the Festival of Weeks, or, alternatively, the Festival of Firstfruits (*Jub.* 6:17, 20–22). The third month is the covenant month for *Jubilees*, and, more specifically, the Festival of Weeks that starts on the 15th of the third month is the day of the covenant.⁷¹ By closely associating the Festival of Weeks with the making of the covenant, the author can explicitly link the biblical covenants together.

⁶⁷ van Ruiten, “Covenant of Noah,” 167–190.

⁶⁸ van Ruiten, “Covenant of Noah,” 177.

⁶⁹ van Ruiten, “Covenant of Noah,” 177–183.

⁷⁰ Halpern-Amaru, *Rewriting the Bible*, 28.

⁷¹ Werner Eiss explores the title of the festival, suggesting that the author is using a play on the Hebrew word for “week/seven” and the “oath” associated with covenant ratification, Werner Eiss, “Das Wochenfest im Jubiläenbuch und im Antiken Judentum,” in *Studies in the Book of Jubilees*, ed. Matthias Albani, Jörg Frey, and Armin Lange (Tübingen: Mohr, 1997), 165. Kugel, *A Walk*, 59; James C. VanderKam, “Covenant and Pentecost,” *CTJ* 37 (2002): 241–43.

For this reason it has been ordained and written on the heavenly tablets that they should celebrate the festival of weeks during this month—once a year—to renew the covenant each and every year. This entire festival had been celebrated in heaven from the time of creation until the lifetime of Noah From the day of Noah’s death his sons corrupted (it) until Abraham’s lifetime and were eating blood. Abraham alone kept (it), and his sons Isaac and Jacob kept it until your lifetime. During your lifetime the Israelites had forgotten (it) until I renewed (it) for them at this mountain. (*Jub.* 6:17–19)

The Festival of Weeks thus links the covenants with Noah, the patriarchs, and Moses, and also demonstrates that the later covenants are really *renewals* of the one, eternal covenant.

The explicit link in *Jub.* 6 plays out in the wider narrative. The entire fictive setting occurs on the 16th of the third month, which is the day after God has made the Sinai Covenant with Moses (*Jub.* 1:1–2; cf. Exod 19:1).⁷² It is from this biblical precedent of the Sinai covenant that the author projects backwards so that the covenant scenes with Noah (*Jub.* 6:1, 16) and with Abram/Abraham (*Jub.* 14:1; 15:1) occur on precisely the same date.⁷³ Concerning the reading of Gen 9:16 in *Jubilees*, VanderKam concludes, “The writer took seriously the implications of the word ‘eternal’ that modifies Noah’s covenant. If there was an eternal covenant, then a new one was not necessary; the ancient one had simply to be renewed.”⁷⁴ It is interesting to highlight in this context that Noah was the first to celebrate the Festival of Weeks *on earth*. In fact, the festival had been celebrated *in heaven* by the angels all along since the time of creation.

Jubilees also marks out with the third month other events associated with the covenant, including the substantiation of one’s status as the covenant representative. *Jubilees* is in dialogue with the biblical narrative’s penchant for favoring the son who is in point of

⁷² On how the author came to the exact date of the 16th of the third month, see James C. VanderKam, “Studies on the Prologue and Jubilees 1,” in *For a Later Generation: The Transformation of Tradition in Israel, Early Judaism, and Early Christianity*, ed. Randal A. Argall, Beverly A. Bow, and Rodney Alan Werline (Harrisburg, PA: Trinity Press International, 2000), 279.

⁷³ van Ruiten, “Covenant of Noah,” 185–8. There is also a covenant between Jacob and Laban that is cut in the third month (*Jub.* 29:5, 7).

⁷⁴ VanderKam, “Covenant and Biblical Interpretation in Jubilees 6,” 98.

fact *not* the firstborn son. The younger sons are validated in *Jubilees* by the month in which they are born despite their actual birth order. Concerning Isaac, *Jubilees* emphasizes the timing of his birth in answering the covenantal promise of descendants to Abraham (*Jub.* 16:13): “in the third month; in the middle of the month, on the day that the Lord had told Abraham—on the festival of the firstfruits of the harvest—Isaac was born.” Moreover, the author takes advantage of the fact that Genesis leaves unspecified the feast thrown for Isaac’s weaning and the dismissal of Hagar and Ishmael (Gen 21:8). With this license, the author is able to select the month as the third, so that the festival could be none other than the Festival of Firstfruits (*Jub.* 17:1). The result is that Isaac is elect as firstborn, the covenant representative (*Jub.* 18:11); Ishmael is not. As the reader moves forward in the narrative, one finds an extensive addition to the biblical material in which Abraham’s deathbed blessing of his grandson Jacob takes place in the third month (*Jub.* 22:1–6). Abraham had earlier observed the behavior of his grandsons and concluded that his reputation would be carried on by the younger rather than the older (cf. 19:13–25; cf. 22:10–30). Again, the point is that Jacob is the firstborn, covenant representative; Esau is not. Finally, it is interesting to note that of Jacob’s sons, Judah is the one born in the third month and *not* Levi (*Jub.* 28:15).⁷⁵ In light of *Jubilees*’ tendency to highlight the priesthood and Levi, the fact that Judah is the son born in the “covenant” month suggests the necessity to acknowledge that the covenantal line would go through King David.⁷⁶

The preceding discussion shows that the author conceived of a single, eternal covenant between God and Jacob’s descendants. The “division of the times of the law and the testimony” denotes the manner in which the covenant is worked out in history. These

⁷⁵ Levi is born on 1st of the first month, however, the other significant month in *Jubilees*.

⁷⁶ van Ruiten, “Covenant of Noah,” 188.

observations in combination with the application of divine sonship language to Israel at creation, restoration, and new creation leads to the conclusion that the author was arguing that Israel was always and always will be God's covenant people, that is, God's firstborn.⁷⁷

2.2.2.2 Covenantal History and "Divisions of the Times of the Law and the Testimony"

"The divisions of the times of the law and the testimony" is a significant phrase for *Jubilees* because of its four prominent occurrences in the prologue and *Jub.* 1:4, 26 and 29. The phrase may even have served as the earliest title for *Jubilees* because of its placement in the prologue. *Jubilees* 1:29 confirms this suggestion, as the material which Moses records is designated the "divisions of the years from the time the law and the testimony were created." *Jubilees* 2:1 then transitions to the angel's dictation to Moses. Thus, Cana Werman is correct to conclude that, precisely speaking, "the Book of Jubilees, beginning with ch.2, is the תורה and the תעודה dictated to Moses on Sinai."⁷⁸ In other words, "the divisions of the times of the law and the testimony" is *Jubilees* own self-description of its content.

The phrase "divisions of times" clearly describes some type of divinely ordained ordering of the world's history. The phrase "the law and the testimony (*te'udah*⁷⁹)," however,

⁷⁷ Pace Gilders, "Covenant in Jubilees," 182–184, who, despite similar analysis in many respects, distinguishes between relationship and covenant, the former being prior and more fundamental than the latter. *Jubilees* does not appear to distinguish between the two because the author's burden is to demonstrate that election, law, and therefore covenant were present from the beginning of creation. In this regard, Segal's suggestions that the author views the heavenly tablets as containing both the laws and witness to the covenant is intriguing, Segal, *Jubilees*, 313–316.

⁷⁸ "The תורה and the תעודה' Engraved on the Tablets," *DSD* 9.1 (2002): 79.

⁷⁹ A comparison of 4Q216 and 4Q217 confirm that the Ethiopic phrase *hegg wa-sem* ' translates the Hebrew תעודה ותורה. 4Q217 Frg. 2 L. 1 preserves the fullest Hebrew form of the expression: "[] the divisions of the times for the law and for the [testimony]"; [מחלקות העתים לתורה ולתעודה]. There is not enough evidence, however, to determine if the fragment is from *Jubilees*, or a quotation of *Jubilees*, and, if the latter, from where in *Jubilees* it derives; VanderKam and Milik, "Jubilees," 25–27. 4Q216 Col. VII L. 17 corresponds to *Jub.* 2:24 and preserves all of the terms, though in a different order and arguably refers to the Mosaic Torah rather than a self reference to *Jubilees*: "This is the testimony and the fir[st] law[]"; [וזאת התעודה והתורה הראשונה]; DJD 13:19–20. Despite not referring to the 'law and the testimony', 4Q216 Col. VII L.17 in combination with 4Q217 Frg. 2 L. 1 confirm the Hebrew terms of the collocation that are only partially preserved in 4Q216 Col. I L. 6 (התורה[])

has created more discussion. Scholars have read the phrase as meaning that *Jubilees* contains 1) secrets about the ordained times from the heavenly realm,⁸⁰ 2) the “march of history” from beginning to end, divided into periods,⁸¹ 3) a strict warning and admonition against forsaking the law,⁸² or 4) the stipulations of the covenant established from creation.⁸³ For my purposes, it is not necessary to decide on the precise meaning of the phrase “law and testimony.” One key piece of additional evidence, however, comes from Isa 8:16 and 20, the two Hebrew Bible passages that collocate the terms.⁸⁴ In these Isaiah texts the “law and the *te‘udah*” appear to contain information about the near future, though, unlike the *Jubilees* occurrences, the terms are in apposition to each other.⁸⁵ More significantly for my discussion, *Jubilees* links each occurrence of the phrase “divisions of the time of the law and of the testimony” to a certain range of time. The prologue describes the phrase as the “event of the years, of the

(corresponding to the prologue), 4Q216 Col. I L. 11–12 ([לתור] [ולתעודה]) (corresponding to *Jub.* 1:4), and 4Q216 Col. IV L. 4 ([לתור] [ולתעודה]) (corresponding to *Jub.* 1:26); DJD 13:5–12.

In addition to the occurrence of “law and testimony” in *Jub.* 1, the phrase occurs without “the divisions of the times” in *Jub.* 2:24, 33; 3:14.

⁸⁰ George Brooke argues this case from Isa 8:16, 20 and by bringing into the discussion other uses of *te‘udah* in the Qumran scrolls (4Q369 I i 7; 4Q215 I ii 5; 4Q300 I ii 2; 4Q525; 4Q298); “Exegetical Strategies in *Jubilees* 1-2: New Light from 4QJubilees^a,” in *Studies in the Book of Jubilees*, ed. Matthias Albani, Jörg Frey, and Armin Lange, Texts and Studies in Ancient Judaism 65 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1997), 52.

⁸¹ Werman, “Engraved on the Tablets,” 82–83.

⁸² Kugel, *A Walk*, 3–4. “עוד” BDB 729–730. Kugel looks to the more common Hebrew root ע-ד-ד to argue that *te‘udah* needs to be understood as “protest, warn, exhort solemnly, admonish, charge.” Kugel also comments that his interpretation matches the Ge‘ez term employed, *səmə*: Dillman’s second entry is “*tertimonium, testificatio, contestatio*,” August Dillmann, *Lexicon Linguae Aethiopicae: Cum Indice Latino* (New York: Frederick Ungar, 1955), 338.

⁸³ Segal, *Jubilees*, 299–301.

⁸⁴ Isa 8:16 ‘Bind up the testimony (תעודה), seal the teaching (תורה) among my disciples’.

Isa 8:20 ‘Now if people say to you, ‘Consult the ghosts and the familiar spirits that chirp and mutter; should not a people consult their gods, the dead on behalf of the living, for teaching (לתורה) and for instruction (ולתעודה)?’ Surely, those who speak like this will have no dawn!’.

⁸⁵ Werman, “Engraved on the Tablets,” 82.

weeks of their jubilees throughout all the years of eternity.” Verses 5–6 unpack the phrase in v. 4 as a prediction of Israel’s future history of unfaithfulness to the covenant. Verse 26 describes the phrase as “what is first and what is last and what is to come during all the divisions of the time.” Finally, verse 29 describes the phrase as “the weeks of their jubilees, year by year in their full number....” It is clear, then, that *Jubilees* deploys the phrase “the divisions of the times of the law and the testimony” as the record of Israel’s past and future history. Moreover, *Jubilees* describes the pattern of Israel’s history as the covenantal pattern of exile and restoration (vv. 7–18, 22–25).

The phrase “the divisions of the times of the law and testimony,” then, points to the fact that the covenant occurs in time and space. It is mapped out across the span of world history: the exile and destruction of the Temple were recorded, but more pertinently, the full restoration and fulfillment of the covenant promises were also recorded.⁸⁶ Understood in this way, the driving concern for the author of *Jubilees* pertains directly to “divisions of the times of the law and the testimony.” *Does the experience of the covenant curses mean that the covenant is permanently broken?* In accordance with the book’s overall purpose, the author’s answer is that the course of history heretofore has unfolded according to the contours of the covenant. So, the readers of *Jubilees* are to rest assured that the unfolding of the remainder of history will complete the covenantal course of restoration on into the new creation. The author demonstrates that the proper interpretation of primeval and patriarchal history provides not only a proper understanding of Israel’s history, but also affirms Israel’s

⁸⁶ I note, however, that there may not be a strict division between Segal’s “covenant stipulation” proposal and Kugel’s “warning” proposal. In *Jub.* 29:8, the testimony stands as a warning for either Jacob or Laban against breaking the established covenant.

eschatological hope. Put another way, the narrative structure of Genesis and Exodus is rewritten in order to anchor the theological perspective of sin, exile, and restoration.⁸⁷

2.3 CONCLUSION: DIVINE SONS AS COVENANT MEMBERS

The covenant is an integral concept to the entirety of *Jubilees*. The main issue at hand for the author is whether the covenant between God and Israel continues to exist and, if so, how the coming restoration will be brought about. The author affirms that the covenant does remain. The course of history itself, including the period of covenant curses, confirms this according to the “divisions of the times of the law and testimony.” Conversely, just as predictably as the covenant curses came, so also the covenant restoration and blessings will come. In order to support this claim exegetically, the author uses the connection between divine sonship and covenant in order to establish the existence of election, stipulations, and the covenant at creation as well as the restoration and new creation. The restoration awaits, however, a generation that will rediscover the true manner in which the Torah should be observed—complete with proper chronology, circumcision, and purity regulations—and so once again become aligned with the design of creation and, ultimately, the heavenly realities. The underlying assumption by the author of *Jubilees* that I have highlighted throughout is that familial language, particularly “sons of God,” designates those who are covenant members.

This understanding brings different strands of thought in *Jubilees* together. The firstborn status of Israel has existed since creation; that is, Israel has been chosen for covenant relationship with God. Elements of the Torah have existed since creation; that is, the stipulations of the covenant relationship of sabbath, circumcision, and Festival of Weeks have always been observed. So for *Jubilees*, because election and Torah have existed since

⁸⁷ Brooke, “Exegetical Strategies,” 49. Brooke’s point is specifically on *Jub. 1* in his examination of 4Q216, however it applies well to the whole of *Jubilees*.

creation, so has God's eternal, single covenant. Yet, how are we to conceive of a covenant relationship that exists before the nation and people who occupy that position? Part of *Jubilees'* program is to demonstrate that a segment of the human population from the time of Adam to Moses has been in the same covenant relationship that was inherited by Israel. Moreover, in some sense even the angels are a type of covenant-keeper for *Jubilees*: they observe the sabbath, they were created circumcised, and they celebrate the covenant feast of Weeks.⁸⁸

Careful examination of *Jubilees* has demonstrated how one Jewish author has quite naturally blended fresh divine revelation with covenantal history. This thoroughly covenantal text contains knowledge from the heavenly tablets revealed through an angelic mediator and given to only a select few. This revealed knowledge is precisely covenantal knowledge about the course of history as shown in our discussion of Torah and *te 'udah* in *Jubilees*. The import of the special knowledge enables the people to keep the Torah properly and so to bring about the restoration of the covenant. Though not discussed in this chapter, the point of protection from demonic powers and the reception of a spirit of holiness in *Jubilees* is to enable the people of the covenant to remain faithful to the stipulations (cf. *Jub.* 1:23; 10:1–14). Thus, in *Jubilees* the heavenly revelations complement the covenantal elements rather than giving evidence of two separate systems of thought.

Now that *Jubilees'* conception of the covenant has been developed in its own terms, laying out three subsequent observations concerning the depiction of the sons of God as covenant members establishes *Jubilees'* essential purpose. Namely, *Jubilees'* covenant theology and the motif of divine sonship serve to legitimize Israel's status and secure

⁸⁸ It is interesting to note in this connection that *Jubilees* does *not* refer to angelic beings as "sons of God," even in the rewriting of Gen. 6:2. Is this a special status reserved for Israel to distinguish them even from the angels in *Jubilees*?

confidence in the people's pre-established relationship with God despite present circumstances.

First, there is significant overlap between the divine sonship/primogeniture language in *Jubilees* and the firstborn of the patriarchs and the line of the covenant. The discussion of God's sons naturally spills over into a discussion of the patriarchs' true descendants. This is clearest in *Jub.* 19:26–29 (§2.2.1.3), where Abraham's recognition of Jacob as his true covenant representative constitutes Jacob as God's firstborn (19:29). Thus, *Jubilees* depicts Abraham's descendants and God's firstborn as essentially synonymous epithets for covenant members. In so doing, *Jubilees* shows that Israel, like the patriarchs, participate in the single, eternal covenant which, though at times broken, is faithfully renewed by God.

For *Jubilees* the earthly covenant members, i.e. the sons of God, correspond to the heavenly realities when they observe the sabbath, Festival of Weeks, and circumcision (§2.2.1.2). Israel's election to the covenant and reception of the law aligned the nation with the angelic worship of God done by the two highest classes of angels. More significantly, when Israel observes the sabbath, they imitate the Lord himself. When Israel receives circumcision, the covenant people are able to enter into the presence of the angels and the Lord. The obedience of God's sons to God's commands allows the sons to imitate the father and enjoy his covenantal presence.

Finally, the identity of the sons of God is obscured by present circumstances for *Jubilees*. This can be inferred because *Jubilees*' description of the restoration of the covenant in *Jub.* 1:24–25 includes the divine authentication to “every angel and spirit” of the identity of God's children. Moreover, in the eschatological description in *Jub.* 1:28, the Lord's appearing in the sight of all affirms that he is “God of Israel, the father of all Jacob's children.” The identity of the sons of God will be fully vindicated when the Lord appears in

the sight of all. In other words, while the divine presence is enjoyed in the present when heaven and earth align through observing the law, in the eschatological fullness the divine presence will be fully visible with Israel. In both situations, the present and the eschaton, the divine presence marks out the identity of the sons of God.

ELECTION IN *THE BOOK OF JUBILEES*

In the previous chapter, I demonstrated that divine sonship language in *Jubilees* is employed to designate those chosen for the single, eternal covenant. I turn next to investigate the author's conception of Israel's election. In one sense, election in *Jubilees* is a relatively straightforward concept. God chose Jacob and his descendants from the beginning of creation to have a relationship with him unlike any other nation. Under closer examination, however, the author has a highly developed theology of the nature of Israel's election. Election to covenant relationship entails access to the sacred space and sacred times built into the spatial-temporal realities of creation. That is, the intricate calendrical system synchronized Israel's worship with the heavenly worship, and Israel's land inheritance contained the holiest locations on earth. Further, the elect are marked out as recipients of the divine revelation that instructs the covenant people how to fulfill properly their role within the ontological realities of sacred time and sacred space. Within the narrative, this revealed knowledge originates from the heavenly tablets and is transmitted through a written tradition from Enoch, passed on to Noah, Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob before Moses finally receives it on Mt. Sinai. The author of *Jubilees* presents his *own work* as the culmination of the written tradition which is given to Moses. *Jubilees*, being both related to and yet distinct from the Pentateuch, serves as the authoritative interpretation of the Mosaic Torah and, thus, is vital information for the elect to be faithful to the covenant.

The present chapter opens with a discussion of the revealed knowledge contained within the written tradition that is transmitted through the elect in the primeval and patriarchal periods. Then, I demonstrate that the revealed knowledge pertains directly to sacred time, sacred space, and how Israel is to live in correspondence with both. In the final

section of the chapter, I explore the identity of the elect as well as the relationship between moral character and the election of covenant members. The author of *Jubilees* has incorporated lengthy additions, especially to the narratives of Abraham, Isaac, and Levi, in order to demonstrate that the moral character of the elect corresponds to God's choice made during the week of creation. I begin, however, with a discussion of the nature of election in *Jubilees*.

3.1 THE ELECT AND "LAW AND TESTIMONY" AS REVEALED KNOWLEDGE

Jubilees introduces a number of written sources of divine knowledge into the narrative of the Pentateuch. I have already discussed the "law and the testimony," but here I add further definition by way of distinguishing it from the "law and the commandments," the "divisions of the times," and the heavenly tablets. In addition, within the narrative of *Jubilees* there are books composed by humans that are passed along through the generations of the patriarchs. As Hindy Najman comments, "from its opening words onwards, the Book of Jubilees demonstrates an extraordinary interest in writing itself as well as in writing's ability to confer authority."¹ I argue that *Jubilees* uses the transmission of the written divine revelation in order to mark out the line of the elect and, moreover, that *Jubilees* presents itself as one in this line of written sources of divine revelation. After showing how the written tradition marks out the elect, I demonstrate that the divine revelation contained within the books gives Israel access to the sacred space and sacred times of the cosmos.

¹ Hindy Najman, "Interpretation as Primordial Writing: Jubilees and Its Authority Conferring Strategies," *JSJ* 30.4 (1999): 381. The following discussion has many similarities to Najman's; however, she was focused on writing as an authority conferring strategy while we will connect writing to election.

3.1.1 DEFINING TERMS: THE MOSAIC TORAH, *JUBILEES*, AND THE HEAVENLY TABLETS

Before I examine the transmission of the writings, it will be helpful to clarify the distinction and inter-relationship between the different writings presented in *Jubilees*. Though some of this discussion parallels the description of rewritten Bible, my primary focus here is how the writings function *within the narrative* that *Jubilees* presents.² In this analysis, one sees that the heavenly tablets are the original source of the written traditions, which includes both the Mosaic Torah and *Jubilees* itself. Thus, the author of *Jubilees* depicts his writing as having a common source with the biblical material, and so also as having a similar claim to divine revelation.

The author of *Jubilees* supports the claim to special revealed knowledge by exploiting an ambiguity in the narrative of the giving of the Torah in Exod 34.³ In Exod 34:1, Moses is instructed to cut out two stone tablets on which the Lord will write. In apparent contrast, the Lord directs Moses to write on the tablets the words the Lord dictates in Exod 34:27–28. The question left for the interpreter is: *who wrote on the tablets, the Lord or Moses?* The author of *Jubilees* utilizes this interpretive challenge in order to introduce a second divine revelation given to Moses on Sinai. First, the Lord wrote the “law and the commandments”⁴ on two stone tablets and gave them to Moses according to the prologue and *Jub.* 1:1. Second, during

² For a discussion on how the author of *Jubilees* understands his work in relation to Genesis or Exodus, see my earlier comments on rewritten Bible in ch. 2.

³ Werman, “Engraved on the Tablets,” 80.

⁴ The Ethiopic *te’ezāz* is singular in form, thus “commandment” as Wintermute translates the phrase in the prologue and *Jub.* 1:1. VanderKam translates the term “commandments,” apparently because the context implies multiple laws. I have retained VanderKam’s translation for the sake of consistency and because it does not significantly affect my argument.

the 40-day period on the mountain, God related the “law and the testimony”⁵ (*Jub.* 1:4) to Moses (*Jub.* 1:5, 7–8, 26) by way of dictation through the angel of the presence from the heavenly tablets (*Jub.* 1:27–29; 2:1).⁶ Thus, according to the author, two Torahs were received by Moses while on Mt. Sinai: the “law and the commandments” and the “law and the testimony.”⁷

The stone tablets, which contained the “law and the commandments” described in the prologue and *Jub.* 1:1, should be equated with the Pentateuch, the biblical Torah. *Jubilees* 1:1 is a combination of two OT passages, both of which strongly signal the reception of the Mosaic Torah. The first half of the verse roughly follows Exod 19:1: “During the first year of the Israelites’ exodus from Egypt, in the third month—on the sixteenth of the month—the Lord said to Moses”⁸ The main distinction is that *Jubilees* identifies the day of the month in order to signal a covenant event, as discussed earlier. The second half of *Jub.* 1:1 is a close rewriting of Exod 24:12, “The Lord said to Moses: ‘Come up to me on the mountain. I will give you the two stone tablets of the Law and the commandments which I have written so that you may teach them.’”⁹ As Cana Werman discusses, the Hebrew of 4Q216 demonstrates that *Jub.* 1:1 follows the Samaritan Pentateuch and Septuagint text traditions by omitting the

⁵ For convenience, I follow VanderKam in consistently translating the Hebrew term *te’udah* and the Ethiopic term *səmə* ‘with “testimony.”’ See §2.2.2.1.

⁶ Martha Himmelfarb, “Torah, Testimony, and Heavenly Tablets: The Claim to Authority of the Book of Jubilees,” in *A Multiform Heritage: Studies on Early Judaism and Christianity in Honor of Robert A. Kraft*, ed. B.G. Wright (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1999), 19.

⁷ Wacholder, “Super Canon”; Himmelfarb, “Torah, Testimony, and Heavenly Tablets”; Werman, “Engraved on the Tablets,” 77–81.

⁸ Exod 19:1 NRSV: “On the third new moon after the Israelites had gone out of the land of Egypt, on that very day, they came into the wilderness of Sinai.”

⁹ Exod 24:12 NRSV: “The LORD said to Moses, ‘Come up to me on the mountain, and wait there; and I will give you the tablets of stone, with the law and the commandment (הַאֲבֵן וְהַתּוֹרָה וְהַמִּצְוָה), which I have written for their instruction.’”

conjunctive *waw*¹⁰ present in the MT between “stone tablets” and “law and commandments.” While the MT *could be* understood as Moses’ receiving two things, “the stone tablets *and* the law and commandments,” *Jubilees* places the two in apposition, so that the understanding is less ambiguously “the stone tablets, which are the law and the commandments.”¹¹ *Jubilees* 1:2–3 continues the rewriting of Exod 24:15–16 with the description of Moses’ going up the cloud-covered mountain where the glory of the Lord was residing. Thus, the author of *Jubilees* pictures the stone tablets containing the “law and the commandments” as the Torah written by God that Moses received during his first week on Sinai.

In further support of the identification of the “law and the commandments” as the Mosaic Torah, two later passages in *Jubilees* refer to an earlier Torah. In *Jub.* 6:22, the Festival of Weeks is described as being written “in the book of the first law.” Then, in support for the prohibition against Israelite daughters marrying foreigners, the angel of the presence evokes an earlier writing given to Moses: “For this reason I have written for you in the words of the law everything that the Shechemites did to Dinah” (*Jub* 30:12). Within the narrative context of the angel of the presence revealing “the law and the testimony,” these verses should be understood as referring to the previous “law and the commandment,” that is the Mosaic Torah received on Mt. Sinai.¹²

¹⁰ According to 4Q216 Col. I, L. 6; *DJD* 13:5.

¹¹ Werman, “Engraved on the Tablets,” 77–81.

¹² It should be noted that the narrative contexts demand that the one writing these laws was the angel of the presence, not God himself, as with the stone tablets in *Jub.* 1:1. Werman appears to have missed this point, *ibid.*, 78. VanderKam has shown, however, that *Jubilees* attributes actions to the angel of the presence that are attributed to God in the biblical texts as well as other places in *Jubilees* itself (e.g. making the covenant, *Jub.* 6:19 and *Jub.* 1:5; Exod. 24:8; 34:10, 27; Deut. 4:23; 5:2; 9:9; the calling of Abram *Jub.* 12:22 and Gen. 12:1; standing between the Egyptians and the Israelites during the exodus *Jub.* 48:13 and Exod. 13:21; 14:19a, 30). James C. VanderKam, “The Angel of the Presence in the Book of Jubilees,” *DSD* 7.3 (2000): 390–392. Thus, because of the blurred lines between divine action and the actions of the angel of the presence, the significant point is that this previous Torah *was not recorded by Moses*.

The second Torah received and recorded by Moses on Mt. Sinai is the “law and the testimony.” In the previous chapter, I discussed the significance and interpretation of the phrase, but here I specify that it likely was part the original title of the book as a whole. The prologue opens with, “These are the words regarding the divisions of the times of the law and the testimony,” with “these words” apparently referring to the entirety of the *Book of Jubilees*.¹³ This conclusion is corroborated by the three other occurrences of the phrase in the chapter, all of which describe the content of God’s revelation to Moses during the 40 days and nights on Sinai, which is subsequently recorded by Moses (2:1). So, speaking precisely, the content of the “law and testimony” is everything the angel dictated to Moses following *Jub. 2:1*.¹⁴

The heavenly tablets serve as the source for the “law and the testimony.” In *Jub. 1:29*, the angel of the presence dictates to Moses from certain unnamed tablets:

The angel of the presence, who was going along in front of the Israelite camp, took the tablets (which told) of the divisions of the years of their jubilees, year by year in their full number, and their jubilees from [the time of the creation until] the time of the new creation (*Jub. 1:29*)

Although the tablets are not explicitly identified as the heavenly tablets in the opening chapter, *Jub. 6:35* identifies the source from which the angel dictates as the heavenly tablets. So, the angel dictates the “divisions of the years,” content found on the heavenly tablets, and Moses records the dictation on the “law and the testimony.” Werman’s further assertion,

¹³ So, Kugel, *A Walk*, 2.

¹⁴ Werman, “Engraved on the Tablets,” 79. B.Z. Wacholder has suggested that the “torah and the testimony” was fashioned after Moses’ song that served as a witness (השירה הזאת לעד) against Israel’s unfaithfulness in Deut 31:19 in such a way that the author could plausibly suggest *Jubilees* was the book recorded and stored in the ark, “Super Canon.” While the persistent echoes of Deut 31 in *Jub. 1* offer some support, Wacholder’s intriguing suggestion is speculative. Wacholder further suggests that the “law and the commandment” was the public and inferior Torah which the Levites and elders possessed (Deut. 31:9), while the “law and the testimony” (translated as Torah-Admonition) was the superior Torah hidden in the ark (Deut. 31:25–26), which would govern the restoration and usher in the eschaton. This does not match the evidence. The author’s distinction between the two Torahs rests on the fact that one is said to be recorded by God and the other by Moses, while both Torahs in Deut 31:9 and 31:25–26 are inscribed by Moses.

however, that the “tablets of the divisions of the times of the law and the testimony” are *equivalent to the heavenly tablets* pushes beyond the evidence.¹⁵ If *Jubilees* were intended to be equivalent with the heavenly tablets, it would be difficult to understand *Jubilees*’ constant reference to the heavenly tablets as an external authoritative source.¹⁶ Rather, the heavenly tablets should be understood as the separate and prior source from which the angel dictates.

It will be helpful now to summarize the distinctions and relationships between the “law and the commandments,” “the divisions of times of the law and the testimony,” the heavenly tablets, and *The Book of Jubilees* itself. The “law and the commandments” are the Mosaic Torah that God himself recorded and gave to Moses on Sinai. The phrase “law and the testimony” is a self-reference to *The Book of Jubilees*, whose content is the “divisions of the times/years.” The heavenly tablets are the source from which the angel of the presence dictates the “divisions of the times” to Moses to record in the “law and the testimony,” that is, *Jubilees* itself. As I show below, *Jubilees* claims that the heavenly tablets contain some information that is found in the Mosaic Torah as well as information only found in the “law and the testimony,” indicating that the heavenly tablets are the source for both Torahs given to Moses on Sinai. Thus, the author’s precise claim is that *The Book of Jubilees* provides its readers an authorized glimpse into the “divisions of the times” contained on the heavenly tablets in a similar way as the Mosaic Torah provides partial access to the heavenly tablets.

Due to the importance of the heavenly tablets in *Jubilees*, it is necessary at this point to draw out their nature and function with respect to the Mosaic Torah. The occurrences of the heavenly tablets in *Jubilees* have been most thoroughly cataloged and analyzed by

¹⁵ Werman, “Engraved on the Tablets,” 88–90.

¹⁶ Werman recognizes this problem and attempts to answer it by appeal to the “tools of poetics” and three different narrative perspectives, *ibid.*, 89. This seems to complicate the question that, in my opinion, can be given the more straightforward explanation.

Florentino García Martínez, who describes five categories of usage: “Tablets of the Law,” “Heavenly Register of Good and Evil,” “The Book of Destiny,” “Calendar and Feasts,” and “New Halakot.”¹⁷

Numerically, the last two categories represent the majority of occurrences in accordance with the author’s emphases. The distinction between the first category and the last is that Tablets of Law are laws recorded in the Pentateuch though attributed to the heavenly tablets, while New Halakot refers to laws that have no precedent in biblical materials. The heavenly tablets predate the Mosaic Torah within the narrative, so the overlap in material between them (i.e., Tablets of Law) implies that the heavenly tablets actually served as the prior source of the Mosaic Torah, or, in García Martínez’s words, the “pre-existing archetype of the Torah.”¹⁸ Concerning the New Halakot, while there are some clear cases of new laws with no biblical referent,¹⁹ it should be noted that many of the laws categorized as New Halakot are actually “amplifications” or clarifications of laws found in the Mosaic Torah according to García Martínez.²⁰ For example, he categorizes *Jubilees*’ version of the circumcision law as New Halakot primarily because of the inclusion of the emphasis on the eighth day while the MT of Gen 17:12–14 does not mention the precise timing.²¹ Thus, the

¹⁷ Florentino García Martínez, “The Heavenly Tablets in the Book of Jubilees,” in *Studies in the Book of Jubilees*, ed. Matthias Albani, Jörg Frey, and Armin Lange (Tübingen: Mohr, 1997), 243–60.

¹⁸ E.g. Postpartum impurity *Jub.* 3:9–11 and Lev. 12:2–5; malicious beating of a fellow *Jub.* 4:5 and Deut 27:24; Lev 5:1; incest *Jub.* 33:10 and Lev 20:11; Deut 23:1; *ibid.*, 244.

¹⁹ Requirement of clothing (*Jub.* 3:30–31); marriage of older daughters before younger (*Jub.* 28:6).

²⁰ *Jub.* 4:32 amplifies Lev 24:19–20; *Jub.* 15:25 and Gen 17:12–14; *Jub.* 30:7–9 combines the sin of Ezra 9–10 and Neh 13:27 with the punishment for offering a child to Moloch (stoning) and the daughter of a priest who prostitutes herself (burning); *Jub.* 32:10–15 appears to clarify Deut 14:22–23. García Martínez, “The Heavenly Tablets in the Book of Jubilees,” 255–258.

²¹ García Martínez, “The Heavenly Tablets in the Book of Jubilees,” 256. Though García Martínez does acknowledge that both the Samaritan Pentateuch and LXX do include mention of the eighth day, making it possible that *Jubilees* was merely following these text traditions rather than innovating.

new laws introduced in *Jubilees* are either derived from the Mosaic Torah or merely supplement the Mosaic Torah in a non-contradictory manner.

These observations indicate that *Jubilees* regards the Mosaic Torah, the “law and the commandments,” as a respected authority and a genuine—albeit incomplete—representative of the heavenly tablets. Within the narrative setting, the heavenly tablets serve as the source for the Mosaic Torah, and as such stand in an authoritative position over the Mosaic Torah. The heavenly tablets have the authority, then, to affirm, clarify, or supplement the Mosaic Torah. García Martínez’s most important observation concerning the heavenly tablets in *Jubilees* is the similarity in function to the Oral Torah within Rabbinic Judaism. According to García Martínez, “the [heavenly tablets] constitute a hermeneutical recourse which permits the presentation of the ‘correct’ interpretation of the Law, adapting it to the changing situations of life.”²² That is, the heavenly tablets provide the author with an appropriate vehicle to authenticate a particular interpretation of the Mosaic Torah.

This understanding of the heavenly tablets elucidates *Jubilees*’ self-understanding of its relationship to the Mosaic Torah. Material from the heavenly tablets shared in both the “law and the commandments” and the “law and the testimony” serves to affirm the Mosaic Torah while at the same time elevating the status of *Jubilees*.²³ Thus, the Mosaic Torah is rendered a true but partial revelation of the heavenly tablets, and *Jubilees* offers the necessary supplemental but non-contradictory divine revelation. *Jubilees* presents itself as the authoritative interpreter of the Mosaic Torah rather than a superior Torah intended to replace

²² García Martínez, “The Heavenly Tablets in the Book of Jubilees,” 258.

²³ In this conclusion, I largely agree with Himmelfarb, “Torah, Testimony, and Heavenly Tablets,” 27. Himmelfarb’s distinction, however, that a testimony is “not a book of law, but a book about time” goes beyond the evidence (23). The “law and the commandments” and the “law and the testimony” cover *both* laws and calendar. Nevertheless, our final conclusions are similar.

the original.²⁴ *Jubilees*' vision into the heavenly tablets provides the readers with an understanding of how to be faithful to the covenant. On the basis of the authority derived from the heavenly tablets, new laws introduced in *Jubilees* receive authoritative status on par with laws already in the Pentateuch. The author highlights his own halakhic emphases, including the calendrical system, as well as clarifies points of debate emerging from the Mosaic Torah. Moreover, the heavenly tablets provide an explanation as to why pre-Sinai covenant members followed similar commandments as given on Mt. Sinai. The patriarchs had access to divine knowledge from the heavenly tablets because they were marked out by possession of a line of sacred writings, a motif to which I presently turn.

3.1.2 THE ELECT AS TRADENTS OF THE WRITTEN TRADITION

Within its own narrative, *The Book of Jubilees* stands as a member of a line of written witnesses to the heavenly tablets circulating since the pre-Sinaitic period and transmitted through the patriarchs.²⁵ I trace this line from Enoch through to Moses in this section because the reception of these books and ability to read them is an important marker of those elected to covenant relationship. Certainly the content of the line of written works is significant for

²⁴ Contra Wacholder's suggestion in "Super Canon." For further arguments against Wacholder's thesis, see Himmelfarb, "Torah, Testimony, and Heavenly Tablets" as well as our section on rewritten Bible above.

²⁵ There are several ancient references to the writings of Noah (e.g., 1QapGen Col. V L. 29; *Aram. Levi Doc.* 57), which have led some scholars to speculate about an independent circulation of this writing. For a summary of the evidence and suggested outline of the text, see Florentino García Martínez, "4QMess Ar and the Book of Noah," in *Qumran and Apocalyptic* (Leiden: Brill, 1992), 24–44; James M. Scott, *Geography in Early Judaism and Christianity: The Book of Jubilees*, SNTSMS 113 (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002), 35–36. Himmelfarb lists the differences between *Jubilees*' description of Noah's writing and what has been called "The Book of Noah" (the introduction to the ninth- or tenth- century Hebrew Medical work, *Book of Asaph*). She then speculates that both the author of *Jubilees* and the compiler of *Book of Asaph* drew from an earlier work ("The Book of Noah: A New Translation and Introduction," in *Old Testament Pseudepigrapha: More Noncanonical Scriptures*, ed. Richard Bauckham, James R. Davila, and Alexander Panayotov, 1 (Cambridge: Eerdmans, 2013), 40–44). I am primarily interested here in observing the function of the writings of Noah within the narrative.

the understanding of heavenly realities. But even the mere possession of the books themselves serves to identify Israel as the covenant people.

In *Jubilees*, the written tradition of divine revelation originates with Enoch according to *Jub.* 4:17–19:

He was the first of mankind who were born on the earth who learned (the art of) writing, instruction, and wisdom and who wrote down in a book the signs of the sky in accord with the fixed pattern of their months so that mankind would know the seasons of the years according to the fixed patterns of each of their months. He was the first to write a testimony. He testified to mankind in the generations of the earth: The weeks of the jubilees he related, and made known the days of the years; the months he arranged, and related the sabbaths of the years, as we had told him. While he slept he saw in a vision what has happened and what will occur—how things will happen for mankind during their history until the day of judgment. He saw everything and understood. He wrote a testimony for himself and placed it upon the earth against all mankind and for their history.

Enoch, as the first literate human, records a “testimony” that includes calendrical information, sabbaths, jubilees, and a testimony against humanity in preparation for judgment. There is no explicit link to the heavenly tablets;²⁶ however, the overlap in content of Enoch’s book (calendrical information, testimony of the past and future of the earth, testimony against mankind) in addition to the revelation through the angels of the presence (v. 18c) strongly suggest Enoch is recording information from the tablets just as Moses was on Sinai. Indeed, the inference may be so strong that the author could simply assume the link between the heavenly tablets and Enoch’s testimony.²⁷ Enoch is the first literate human and the first to write a testimony (v. 18a), thus signaling that the reader should anticipate future written testimonies.

²⁶ As briefly noted by Eibert J. C. Tigchelaar, “Jubilees and 1 Enoch and the Issue of Transmission of Knowledge,” in *Enoch and Qumran Origins: New Light on a Forgotten Connection* (Grand Rapids, Mich.: Eerdmans, 2005), 100.

²⁷ Himmelfarb, “Torah, Testimony, and Heavenly Tablets,” 27.

Noah, too, is a recipient of the written tradition. The first book associated with Noah contains the proper geographical divisions of the earth that his three sons should inherit (*Jub.* 8:11).²⁸ The second book is written by Noah, who is given knowledge by the angels of the presence to cure diseases and deceptions from evil spirits (*Jub.* 10:12–13). Finally, Noah passed all the books he had written onto Shem because “he loved him much more than all his sons” (*Jub.* 10:14). The significance of the passage for our discussion is that Shem is marked out by the reception of the sacred books as the loved son, that is to say, the son through whom the covenant will be maintained.

Jubilees presents Abram as the next in line to receive and copy the texts of Enoch and Noah. Subsequent to Abram’s rejection of idolatry, the Lord instructed the angel of the presence as follows:

“Open his [Abram’s] mouth and his ears to hear and speak with his tongue in the revealed language.” For from the day of the collapse it had disappeared from the mouth(s) of all mankind. I opened his mouth, ears, and lips and began to speak Hebrew with him—in the language of the creation. He took his fathers’ books (they were written in Hebrew) and copied them. From that time he began to study them, while I was telling him everything that he was unable (to understand). He studied them throughout the six rainy months. (*Jub.* 12:25–27)

Within the narrative that *Jubilees* creates, the writings of Enoch and Noah appear to be preserved but not understood in the post-flood chaos until the time of Abram. The Hebrew language in which the tradition was written had been lost since the time of the “collapse” of Babel.²⁹ As the “revealed language,” “the language of the creation,” and the language of the divine written tradition, Hebrew itself is elevated to a unique status that matches the status of

²⁸ This material will be discussed at greater length below (§3.2.2).

²⁹ As Najman comments, “So essential for the authority of teaching is continuous written tradition, that *Jubilees* must find continuity even where it must also emphasize discontinuity: between the first patriarch and the idolatrous society whose errors he fled in order to found a distinct and separate people,” “Interpretation as Primordial Writing,” 386.

the elect. Thus, while Abram was taught the art of writing by Terah (*Jub.* 11:16), divine intervention was required for him to be able to read the books of his fathers, presumably the books of Enoch and Noah.

While *Jubilees* contains a somewhat abridged narrative of Isaac, he too is a tradent of the written traditions, at least by implication. In Abraham's final testimony to Isaac, he instructs his son in how to keep God's commands, ordinances, and verdicts by instructing on the proper procedures of priestly sacrifice, bodily purity, and moral goodness (*Jub.* 21:1–26). Significantly for our present argument, Abraham's justification for the period of time in which sacrifices are to be consumed in *Jub.* 21:10d is based on the books of Enoch and Noah: "All who eat it will bring guilt on themselves because this is the way I found (it) written in the books of my ancestors, in the words of Enoch and the words of Noah." Abraham's last testimony to Isaac is based on the writings of his ancestors Enoch and Noah whose written works are here described as authoritative prescriptions for the temple cult.³⁰

Jacob is the next in line to receive and record the sacred writings based on the heavenly tablets (*Jub.* 32:21–26). Upon his return to Bethel to fulfill a vow of building a temple (*Jub.* 32:16; cf. 28:22), Jacob received a vision:

In a night vision he saw an angel coming down from heaven with seven tablets in his hands. He gave (them) to Jacob, and he read them. He read everything that was written in them—what would happen to him and his sons throughout all ages. (*Jub.* 32:21)

The tablets are not labeled as the heavenly tablets nor is the angel identified as the angel of the presence.³¹ Yet they should be identified as the heavenly tablets based on their content, their descent from heaven, and the angelic connection. After the vision, Jacob was instructed to record all that he had read from the tablets with the assistance of the angel who brought the

³⁰ In *Jub.* 21, Abraham instructs Isaac on peace offerings (vv. 6–9), when the meat of an offering should be eaten (vv. 10–11), the type of wood to be used on the altar (vv. 12–15), and priestly purity (vv. 16–20).

³¹ Again, as noted by Tigchelaar, "Transmission of Knowledge," 100.

tablets down. The immediate ramification of the incident within the narrative is Jacob's decision not to build a temple in Bethel because it was not the place (*Jub.* 32:22), a narrative strand emphasizing geography that I pick up again below.

Jacob then passed his own books and the books of his fathers to Levi "so that he could preserve them and renew them for his sons until today" (*Jub.* 45:16). The selection of Levi to receive the written tradition naturally follows from his election to the priesthood. Moreover, the "today" of *Jub.* 45:16 extends the line of the written tradition all the way to the narrative setting with Moses on Mt. Sinai. The author has established Moses' literacy and eligibility to receive the tradition through his father. Amram was in the line of Levi and instructed Moses in the art of writing before his presentation to Pharaoh's daughter (*Jub.* 47:9). The result is that, as his forefathers before him, Moses was prepared to receive and record the revelation anew with the help of the angel of the presence.

There is an interesting foil set up in contrast to the written tradition handed down through the elect. Kainan is recorded as propagating a counterfeit written tradition in *Jub.* 8:2–3:

When the boy [Kainan] grew up, his father taught him (the art of) writing He found an inscription which the ancients had incised in a rock. He read what was in it, copied it, and sinned on the basis of what was in it, since in it was the Watchers' teaching (*Jub.* 8:2–3)

So, the sacred texts which mark out the elect are not books in general, but only writings originating in the heavenly tablets. By way of contrast, the presence of this counterfeit written tradition serves to highlight further the reception of the true sacred texts by the elect.

3.1.3 CONCLUSIONS ON THE WRITTEN TRADITION

Those who are chosen for covenant membership from Enoch to Moses are portrayed as tradents of the written tradition. Assistance from the angel of the presence ensures the

accuracy of content and understanding. Najman correctly concludes: “For Jubilees, authoritative teaching consistently takes the form of writing including, prominently, writing that is found on heavenly tablets whose contents are revealed to humans and then transmitted in written books.”³² Through the narrative, the author of *Jubilees* presents his own writing (“the law and the testimony”) as the deposit of sacred writing that stands in line with the books of Enoch, Noah, and the patriarchs. *Jubilees* shows that the Mosaic revelation was only one divine revelation in a series of manifestations of divine knowledge that was written down. In fact, the different recorded revelations—including the Mosaic Torah—were all derived from a single, earlier source known as the heavenly tablets, which figure prominently in the author’s thinking. So, while the Mosaic Torah is affirmed as a genuine revelation of the heavenly tablets, it is only a portion of them, creating space for the author of *Jubilees* to rewrite the narrative so as to give his own writing a level of authority on a par with the Mosaic revelation. This purchase on scriptural authority, however, is not used to contradict the Mosaic Torah. Rather, the author appears content to clarify aspects and endorse particular interpretations. Due to the nature of the information, *Jubilees* becomes essential to interpret properly the Mosaic law and to be faithful covenant members, so that possession of this written tradition not only marked the elect in the patriarchal period, but also the elect in the social setting into which the author of *Jubilees* was writing.³³

³² Najman, “Interpretation as Primordial Writing,” 387–388.

³³ I have primarily noted how writing functions in the narrative, but Najman has argued that the theme is one tool utilized in order to self-authorize *The Book of Jubilees* as the authoritative interpretation of the Mosaic Torah. In a historical setting of disputed biblical interpretations and cultic practices, Najman suggests that *Jubilees* establishes for itself an authoritative status by claiming to contain material from the heavenly tablets, to have been dictated by the angel of the presence, to have been authored—or at least copied—by Moses, and to be derived from the Mosaic Torah (as rewritten Bible), Najman, “Interpretation as Primordial Writing,” 388–409.

3.2 ISRAEL'S ELECTION AND SPATIAL-TEMPORAL REALITY

Having established that the mere possession of the written tradition demarcates the elect in *Jubilees*, I turn now to examining at greater length what information can be found within this tradition. I highlight two strands of information that the written tradition contains from the heavenly tablets concerning the sacred times and sacred space of the cosmos, information that is vital for covenant people to fulfill their role within creation. First, the heavenly tablets describe the sacred calendar, sabbaths, and festivals. For example, Enoch's book contained instructions on the proper calendrical system as a testimony against humanity (*Jub.* 4:17–19). Second, the written tradition locates the holiest places on earth. Noah possessed a book containing the proper geographical divisions of the earth (*Jub.* 8:11). The angel instructed Jacob on the proper location of the Temple based on his reading of the seven gold tablets, so one can infer he gleaned some type of geographical information too (*Jub.* 32:20–23). So, from amongst the other content recorded on the heavenly tablets for *Jubilees*, such as legal material and a record of good and evil, I draw out the two strands of sacred time and sacred space.

In addition, this section seeks to describe why for *Jubilees* divine revelations concerning geography and calendar are necessary for the elect. While it is significant that the revealed knowledge elucidated proper halahkic practice, the information from the heavenly tablets more fundamentally offers a picture of how the cosmos is ordered and the place of God's covenant people within that order. Within this cosmic ordering, the specific practices endorsed by the author gain their significance: when the praxis of the elect aligns with creation's chronological and geographical ordering, the elect enter into proper worship of the Creator in synchronization with the highest classes of angels. Beate Ego argues that the first three laws introduced in the book—Sabbath, postpartum impurity, and clothing—are

paradigmatic for the whole of *Jubilees* in that they are intended to establish sacred time, sacred space, and sacred people.³⁴ In this section, I develop Ego's suggestion by tracing sacred time and sacred space throughout *Jubilees* in order to understand better the sacred people. The revealed knowledge contained in the written tradition and possessed by the elect enables the covenant community to enter their proper place within the created order and, ultimately, to worship properly the Creator.

3.2.1 ELECTION AND SACRED TIME

As I discussed previously, the chronological system of *Jubilees* is a heptadic system that structures the weeks, months, years, weeks of years, and jubilees around the sabbath days. Much has been written about the historical setting, the possible polemics involved, and the origins of the calendrical system. The focus in this section, however, is to draw out what the significance of the calendar is within the narrative developed in *Jubilees*: the theological burden is to bring the covenant people into alignment with the created order. According to Lutz Doering, with the giving of the Torah "there is a *noetic* correspondence to the *ontic* establishment of the sabbath keeping community of God, higher angels, and Israel on the sabbath of creation: Now, all of Israel know of the sabbath commandment and of this day being celebrated together with the heavenly world."³⁵ That is, the reception of the written

³⁴ Ego concludes, "Durch das Tun dieser Gebote fügt sich Israel in die göttliche Schöpfungsordnung ein und partizipiert so am Bereich der Transzendenz"; "Heilige Zeit - Heiliger Raum - Heiliger Mensch: Beobachtungen zur Struktur der Gesetzesbegründung in der Schöpfungs- Und Paradiesgeschichte des Jubiläenbuches," in *Studies in the Book of Jubilees*, ed. Matthias Albani, Jörg Frey, and Armin Lange (Tübingen: Mohr, 1997), 216. On the same themes, James Scott comments, "The ultimate goal of history for *Jubilees* is the complete restoration of sacred time and sacred space, so that what is done in the earthly cultus in the Land of Israel exactly corresponds to the way that things are done in the heavenly cultus, that is, in accordance with the will of God from creation as inscribed on the heavenly tablets" Scott, *On Earth As In Heaven*, 8. Also, Jörg Frey, "Zum Weltbild im Jubiläenbuch," in *Studies in the Book of Jubilees* (ed. Matthias Albani, Jörg Frey, and Armin Lange; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1997), 261–92.

³⁵ Lutz Doering, "The Concept of the Sabbath in the Book of Jubilees," in *Studies in the Book of Jubilees*, ed. Matthias Albani, Jörg Frey, and Armin Lange (Tübingen: Mohr, 1997), 188.

tradition allowed the elect to conform to the realities of the cosmos. I support this claim with three observations.

First, just as the election of Israel as a holy people was established at creation, so too was the election of certain holy times. The previous discussion of the first Sabbath in *Jub.* 2 focused on the timing of Israel's election (§2.2.1.2). Here, however, I highlight the correspondence between the nature of the nation and the nature of the day.

In *Jubilees*, God relates to the holiest angels, "I will sanctify the people for myself and will bless them *as I sanctified the sabbath day*" (*Jub.* 2:19, emphasis mine). The author also repeatedly emphasizes that just as the sabbath day is holy and blessed (*Jub.* 2:19, 23, 25, 27, 32), "holier than all (other) days" (*Jub.* 2:26), so also Israel is holy and blessed (*Jub.* 2:19, 21, 23, 24). Consequently, Doering concludes, "[t]he sabbath is anchored in creation; it is intimately tied to Israel's election and is, among human beings, the sole privilege of Israel."³⁶ A similar understanding can be observed about the calendar more generally in *Jub.* 6:32–38. When Israel forsakes the proper calendar, "they forget the covenantal festivals and walk in the festivals of the nations" (*Jub.* 6:35). The calendar maintains the all-important distinction between Israel and the Gentiles.

Second, the sabbaths and calendar synchronize Israel's rest and worship with the heavenly observance of the sabbaths and festivals. Along with Israel, the "angels of the presence and all the angels of holiness (these two great kinds)" received the sabbath and observed it in heaven and on earth since creation (*Jub.* 2:17–18, 21, 28). The timing of Israel's celebration of the Festival of Weeks on earth corresponds with the celebration of the festival in heaven, which has been occurring from the time of creation (*Jub.* 6:18–20).

³⁶ Doering, "The Concept of the Sabbath in the Book of Jubilees," 200. See also Henry W Morisada Rietz, "Synchronizing Worship: Jubilees as a Tradition for the Qumran Community," in *Enoch and Qumran Origins: New Light on a Forgotten Connection*, ed. Gabriele Boccaccini (Grand Rapids, Mich.: Eerdmans, 2005), 113.

Further, Israel's priesthood is said to be aligned with the heavenly cult performed by the angels of the presence. Levi and his descendants are compared to the angels in *Jub.* 31:14: "May the Lord ... make you and your descendants (alone) out of all humanity approach him to serve in his temple like the angels of the presence and like the holy ones."³⁷ Thus, the angels of the presence concurrently serve with Levi and his descendants as priests in their respective realms.

Third, observance of the sabbath and the calendar is a form of *imitatio dei*, and thus connects Israel to the Creator. In the biblical material, the sabbath is clearly also associated with God's rest on the seventh day of the creation week (Gen 2:1–3), but *Jubilees* highlights this connection by interjecting Israel's election and the sabbath halakha into the creation narrative (see §2.2.1.2). More subtle, and yet still striking, the jubilee itself is a reflection of divine activity. The law of the jubilee from Lev 25 concerns the redemption of Israelite slaves and the return to their inherited portion of land. The author meticulously dates the national events of the Exodus and possession of the Land of Canaan in the 50th jubilee from creation (*Jub.* 50:1–5).³⁸ Thus, when Israel followed the pattern of the release of slaves and restoration of inheritance in the year of jubilee, the people follow the pattern set by God himself in the jubilee of jubilees.³⁹

³⁷ The notion of angels participating in the heavenly cult is also found in the Songs of the Sabbath Sacrifice. 4Q400 Col. I Ll. 2–5: "[the God of...], O you godlike ones among all the holiest of the holy ones; and in the divinity 3 [of His reign rejoice, for He has established] among the eternally holy the holiest of the holy ones, and they have become for Him priests 4 [of the inner sanctum in His royal sanctuary], ministers of the Presence in His glorious debir." Translation from Carol A. Newsom, ed., *Songs of the Sabbath Sacrifice: A Critical Edition*, Harvard Semitic Studies 27 (Atlanta, Ga: Scholars, 1985). Also cf. the Songs of the Sage, 4Q511 frag. 35. Morisada Rietz discusses the link between *Jubilees* and the Songs of Sabbath Sacrifice, but she also examines how Qumran sectarian texts further develop the idea so that the angel of presence participates in the earthly worship (1QSa2:3–10; CD MS A 15:15–17; 4QD MSS; 1QM 7:3–6); Morisada Rietz, "Synchronizing Worship," 114–118.

³⁸ James C. VanderKam, *Calendars in the Dead Sea Scrolls: Measuring Time*, The Literature of the Dead Sea Scrolls (London: Routledge, 1998), 102.

³⁹ Scott, *On Earth As In Heaven*, 12–15.

3.2.2 ELECTION AND SACRED SPACE

For the author of *Jubilees*, just as Israel's election is built into the temporal structure of the universe, so is Israel's election built into the geographical structure of the universe. For the author, the geographical ordering of nations was inscribed on the written tradition possessed by Noah (*Jub.* 8:11–12).⁴⁰ His sons had divided their inheritance of the earth “in a bad way among themselves” (*Jub.* 8:9), prompting Noah's intervention. Once Noah had divided the earth properly, strict curses were invoked on any son who violated the boundaries of his brothers' inheritance (*Jub.* 10:30–33). Thus, there was one correct, divinely ordained manner in which the earth should be divided.

What was it about Shem's inheritance and Israel's portion that made it well suited for God's elect people? In *Jubilees'* description, Shem received an idealized territory in the center of the earth that included all of its holiest places. According to *Jub.* 8:17–21, within Shem's boundaries were the Garden of Eden, which is the Holy of Holies, Mt. Sinai, and Mt. Zion, which is the navel of the earth.⁴¹ Noah was pleased that his favored son received the portion that was blessed, excellent, spacious, and beautiful. The two other sons of Noah received portions, yet in comparison to Shem's moderate climate, Japheth's land was cold while Ham's land was hot (*Jub.* 8:29–30).

⁴⁰ Najman and VanderKam read the “lot” as a portion of land to be distributed, Najman, “Interpretation as Primordial Writing,” 382; James C. VanderKam, “Putting Them in Their Place: Geography as an Evaluative Tool,” in *Pursuing the Text: Studies in Honor of Ben Zion Wacholder on the Occasion of His Seventieth Birthday*, ed. John C. Reeves and John Kampen (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1994), 58. Kugel, on the other hand, reads *Jub.* 8:11 as “drawing lots” as the means of making a decision that will be formalized in the writing. Nevertheless, drawing lots is ultimately a way of insuring the divine determination of the outcome, *A Walk*, 77.

⁴¹ On the discrepancy in *Jub.* 4:26 in which there are four places which belong to the Lord, the Garden of Eden, *the mountain of the east*, Mt. Sinai, and Zion, see Kugel, *A Walk*, 49–50. He suggests *Jub.* 4:26 was corrupted when a scribe did not realize that “the mountain in the east” is in apposition to “the garden of Eden.” If this is accepted, both lists contain the same three locations.

Jubilees' image of the earth comes into fuller relief when contrasted with the Hellenistic image of the global map. Philip Alexander has shown from a synthesis of the geographical information found in *Jub.* 8–10 that the author was aware of and appropriated Ionian conceptions of the world map.⁴² The shared elements are a disc-shaped earth, three sections divided by rivers, surrounding oceans invading the land, zones of different climates with the middle most temperate, and the center of the earth described as a navel often located at Delphi. Because of these strong parallels in conception, it is probable that the author of *Jubilees* knew of and was interacting with this conception of the earth, as Alexander argues. At the same time, *Jubilees* has altered the presentation of the Ionian world map in order to suit its own ideology. For *Jubilees* the land of Canaan is a misnomer. The Canaanites, as descendants of Ham, did not settle in their hereditary land but supplanted the descendants of Shem (*Jub.* 10:27–34).⁴³ As a result, Abram's entrance into the land is depicted as the *restoration* of the land to its proper inheritors rather than the sojourn of a wandering foreigner.⁴⁴ Moreover, the Greeks belonged in the European continent and their incursions out of their inheritance threatened to bring down a divine curse. In contrast to the Hellenistic conceptions of the globe, Israel—not Greece—was the center of the map. Indeed, Mt. Zion, not Delphi, was the navel of the earth.⁴⁵ Thus, for *Jubilees* the election of Israel vis-à-vis other nations is expressed in Israel's rightful inheritance at the center of the inhabited world.

⁴² Philip S. Alexander, "Notes on the 'Imago Mundi' of the Book of Jubilees," *JJS* 33.1-2 (1982): 197–213.

⁴³ VanderKam wonders if this suggests a second century debate concerning ownership of the land which is represented by later rabbinic texts, "Putting Them in Their Place," 67.

⁴⁴ Betsy Halpern-Amaru, "Exile and Return in Jubilees," in *Exile: Old Testament, Jewish, and Christian Conceptions*, ed. James M. Scott, *JSJSup* 56 (Leiden: Brill, 1997), 132–3.

⁴⁵ Philip S. Alexander, "Jerusalem as the Omphalos of the World: On the History of a Geographical Concept," *Judaism* 46.2 (1997): 147–58.

The claim, however, that Mt. Zion, not Delphi, is the navel of the earth should not be understood as *only* a geo-political claim. Political, yes, but the claim is also religious in nature.⁴⁶ For *Jubilees*, Delphi is not the place where the divine meets the created order. Mt. Zion is. This recognition sheds light on the full significance of Israel's placement in this particular portion of the earth. The Holy Land is the appropriate place for Israel to fulfill its role of worshipping the God of creation *in his presence*. The land's unique link to the divine can be seen in the descriptions of the three holy sites found within. The Garden of Eden is the Holy of Holies and the residence of the Lord (*Jub.* 8:19), and it is protected from impurity by laws that will later protect the Temple.⁴⁷ Within the pre-Sinai narrative setting, Mt. Zion anticipates Solomon's Temple, which will be defiled (1:10; 23:21) and yet will again be the location of God's presence in the eschatological temple (1:17, 27–29).⁴⁸ The glory of the Lord took up residence on Mt. Sinai during the giving of the Torah (*Jub.* 1:2). The holiest sites all located within Shem's inheritance are locations where God's presence has been manifest on earth, thus, as in Noah's blessing, the Lord lives "in the place where Shem resides" (*Jub.* 7:12; cf. Gen 9:27). This inheritance correctly corresponds to the priestly line from Adam, Enoch, Noah, Shem, Abraham, and Jacob. Thus, the privileged status of the people of Israel is matched by the privileged status of their ancestral inheritance.

⁴⁶ Here I push Alexander's analysis, who cautions against importing the nexus of meaning concerning "omphalos" into *Jubilees*. "Jerusalem as the Omphalos," 151. For the reasons I described below, *Jubilees* understands the *omphalos* to be the connection between the divine and earth, and thus religious in nature.

⁴⁷ Impurity from sexual intercourse is in *Jub.* 3:1–7, 9; and postpartum impurity in 3:8–14. Gary Anderson, "Celibacy or Consummation in the Garden? Reflections on Early Jewish and Christian Interpretations of the Garden of Eden," *HTR* 82 (1989): 129.

⁴⁸ Van Ruiten observes that *Jubilees*' positive statements concerning the temple are limited to the protological Garden of Eden or the eschatological Mt. Zion, never being applied to the contemporary temple, Jacques T.A.G.M. van Ruiten, "Visions of the Temple in the Book of Jubilees," in *Gemeinde ohne Tempel*, WUNT 118 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1999), 224.

Jacob's vision at Bethel also indicates that the proper breakdown of the earth's geography primarily concerns the temple and the divine presence. In this instance, an angel brings down from heaven seven gold tablets containing geographic information. In *Jubilees*' rewriting of Gen 35, Jacob has returned to Bethel in order to build a temple in fulfillment of his previous vow (*Jub.* 32:16; cf. 27:26–27). The Lord, however, intervened to put a halt to the plan and, subsequently, Jacob received a night vision in which the angel brought the tablets. After showing him everything on the tablets, the angel instructed Jacob: “Do not build up this place, and do not make it an eternal temple. Do not live here because this is not the place” (*Jub.* 32:22).⁴⁹ Based on information recorded on the tablets, Jacob was shown that Bethel was the wrong location for the temple and, accordingly, that he should not settle there. Jacob and his family were intended to settle around the holiest site at Mt. Zion.

Betsy Halpern-Amaru's thesis concerning the covenantal theology in *Jubilees* will help add precision to my argument here.⁵⁰ She argues that the author has de-emphasized the specific land promises in order to extend the applicability of covenantal restoration theology to a people who have already returned to the land after the Babylonian exile. Halpern-Amaru concludes:

God's relationship with Israel, not the Land promise, becomes the pivot for the covenant which originates at Creation rather than at Abraham's entry into the Land. The biblical links between the Exodus, Sinai, and the Land are deleted. Acquisition, eventual loss, and subsequent recovery of the Land become single rather than singular events in an ongoing redemptive history.⁵¹

⁴⁹ For an attempt to identify the specific social setting behind this episode, see Joshua Schwartz, “Jubilees, Bethel and the Temple of Jacob,” *HUCA* 56 (1985): 63–85.

⁵⁰ This discussion mainly interacts with her chapter “The Metahistorical Covenant in Jubilees” in *Rewriting the Bible*, 25–54. For development of a similar thesis, Halpern-Amaru, “Exile and Return in Jubilees.”

⁵¹ Halpern-Amaru, *Rewriting the Bible*, 53–54.

To support her argument, Halpern-Amaru points to the eternal nature of the covenant, which I discussed in the previous chapter. In addition, she demonstrates that the laws closely tied to the land of Canaan in the biblical material have been de-particularized,⁵² and that the eschatological chapters 1 and 23 describe the covenant restoration primarily in terms of restored relationship with God and restored length to human lifespan rather than a return to the land.⁵³

Halpern-Amaru's point that the author of *Jubilees* has reworked the deuteronomistic land theology to match the present setting of his readers is an important one. The people had returned to the land and the temple was rebuilt, yet the *full* restoration of Israel's relationship with their God was still anticipated. Nevertheless, the significance and unique character of the Land of Canaan remains prominent in the author's rewriting of the biblical material as shown by the following three points. First, as Halpern-Amaru acknowledges, *Jub.* 49:18–19 problematizes her argument for the de-particularization of the land. The Passover Law is emphatically tied to the land of Canaan, with the land referred to five times in the two verses.⁵⁴ Second, *Jubilees* emphasizes the importance of settling in one's ancestral lands in accordance with Noah's division, including severe punishments attached for violators. Thus, as discussed above, Israel's inheritance in the middle of the earth was perpetually reserved for her (*Jub.* 9:14–15). Third, there is the minor theme of ritual purity detectable in *Jubilees*

⁵² Halpern-Amaru, *Rewriting the Bible*, 43–48.

⁵³ Halpern-Amaru, *Rewriting the Bible*, 48–53.

⁵⁴ “When the Israelites enter the land which they will possess—the land of Canaan—and set up the Lord's tabernacle in the middle of the land in one of their tribal groups (until the time when the Lord's temple will be built in the land), they are to come and celebrate the passover in the Lord's tabernacle...49:19 At the time when the house is built in the Lord's name in the land which they will possess...” (*Jub.* 49:18-19; underlining mine).

that is closely associated with sacred space found specifically in the land of Canaan.⁵⁵ Thus, while taking into account Halpern-Amaru's description of the emphasis, I maintain that the particular land of Shem's inheritance was *necessary but not sufficient* for Israel's relationship with her God. That is, the particular land was crucial because it contains the locations where God's presence had been revealed, but, even though Israel found herself back in the land, the full restoration of the covenant had not yet been experienced.⁵⁶

3.2.3 SACRED TIME, SACRED SPACE, SACRED PEOPLE

The conclusion is that Israel, as the collective descendants of Shem, possesses the birthright to the idealized center portion of the earth. More importantly, Israel's land inheritance contains the three holiest places on the earth. In this way, the election of Israel as holy corresponds with the inheritance of the holiest locations on earth. This claimed correspondence between the status of land and people is more than geopolitical posturing for the author. The covenant people must occupy this particular area, which is the future site of the Temple, in order to fulfill their role in the worship of the God of creation. This is the land where God's presence is on earth. In addition, Israel has been entrusted with the holy times built into creation so that the people can synchronize their worship with the heavenly cult and, in observing the sabbath and jubilee, even imitate God himself. This revealed knowledge about the spatial-temporal realities of the cosmos was held within the written tradition

⁵⁵ Ritual purity is found in *Jub.* 3:8–14; 50:8 cf. 2:30, 32; 21:16; 49:9. See Lutz Doering, "Reinheit und Tempel: Ein Beitrag zum Verhältnis von Law Und Narrative im Jubiläenbuch," in *Law and Narrative in the Bible and in Neighbouring Ancient Cultures*, ed. Klaus-Peter Adam, Friedrich Avemarie, and Nili Wazana (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2012), 243–62; Lutz Doering, "Purity and Impurity in the Book of Jubilees," in *Enoch and the Mosaic Torah: The Evidence of Jubilees*, ed. Gabriele Boccaccini and Giovanni Ibba (Grand Rapids, Mich.: Eerdmans, 2009), 261–75.

⁵⁶ Moreover, as we will discuss in the next chapter, *Jub.* 23 pictures the restoration as a gradual process so that the author's views could easily accommodate aspects of the restoration having been realized while others remained expectations.

entrusted to the elect. When these observations on the significance of *Jubilees*' calendar and geography are combined with its emphasis on the priestly purity of Israel as a whole, a coherent picture begins to emerge. As Ego observed, the author is seeking to establish sacred time, sacred space, and sacred people. In other words, Jacob's descendants have been chosen as a priesthood and a holy people.

3.3 ELECTION AND RIGHTEOUSNESS

To this point, I have discussed the nature of Israel's election as God's chosen people built into the creation. The divine revelation contained in the written tradition was passed on through the generations of the elect and informed them of their privileged status within the cosmos. In the remainder of the chapter, I briefly examine the identity of the chosen people according to *Jubilees* before considering the rationale with which the author justifies the biblical choices of Isaac over Ishmael and Jacob over Esau. *Jubilees* displays a strong concern to show that covenant membership corresponds with morality and righteousness, particularly in the narratives of Abraham and Jacob. While election is not *based* on the righteousness of the patriarchs, the author demonstrates a particularly strong concern to show that the patriarchs possessed a high moral quality in *proper correspondence* with their election to the covenant.

3.3.1 JACOB AND ALL HIS DESCENDANTS

In *Jubilees*, the elect community is identified as Jacob and all his descendants. Those born into the physical lineage would need to observe the Torah, including circumcision (*Jub.* 15:25–27), sabbath observance (*Jub.* 2:27), and purity laws (*Jub.* 3:8–14). But, all of the descendants of Jacob are born into the covenant relationship with God. The biblical narrative

describing the patriarchal line of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob requires little alteration to support this point (Gen 15:18; 26:1–5; 35:9–15). Nevertheless, there are two interesting passages added to the biblical base material that place the author’s ideology prominently on display.

First, after recounting the second covenant scene with Abraham (*Jub.* 15; cf. Gen 17), the angel of the presence tells Moses to command the Israelites to maintain the sign of circumcision as an eternal ordinance (*Jub.* 15:28–30). The justification for the command follows:

For the Lord did not draw near to himself either Ishmael, his sons, his brothers, or Esau. He did not choose them (simply) because they were among Abraham’s children, for he knew them. But he chose Israel to be his people. (*Jub.* 15:30)

The presupposition for *Jubilees* is that Isaac and Ishmael, despite being born to different mothers, were both potential heirs of the covenant promises. Moreover, Ishmael was circumcised along with the rest of the men of Abraham’s household as a sign of the covenant, a fact that is emphasized three times in Genesis (Gen 17:23–27; cf. *Jub.* 15:23–24). So, why did the patriarchs’ physically firstborn not enjoy the nearness of God that is the covenant relationship? First, God “knew them,” which arguably suggests God knew their moral character.⁵⁷ The immediate context, though, suggests that only Isaac was circumcised *according to the covenant* because only he conformed to the proper timing on precisely the eighth day (*Jub.* 16:14; cf. 15:25–27).⁵⁸ The result is that Ishmael was not circumcised in

⁵⁷ This is especially clear for the choice of Jacob over Esau, as we will discuss below.

⁵⁸ One may question whether the law is concerned with circumcision generally or the proper timing of circumcision, and there is the difficulty of interpreting the phrase “there is no circumcising of days” in v. 25b. Concerning v. 25c, van Ruiten examines the Ethiopic verb *ta’adwa* and the Latin translation’s equivalent verb *praeterire* to show that the phrase “nor omitting any day of the eight days” (VanderKam’s trans.) indicates circumcision must not wait beyond 8 days. The phrase “there is no circumcising of days” in v. 25b, then, can be understood as the antithesis indicating circumcision must not happen before 8 days. *Jubilees*’ emphasis seems to be that valid circumcision must occur precisely on the 8th day. Van Ruiten, *Abraham*, 155–7. See also ch. 3 from Matthew Thiessen, *Contesting Conversion: Genealogy, Circumcision, and Identity in Ancient Judaism and Christianity* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2011).

accordance with the covenant while Isaac was. I note in this context of the circumcision law that both the angels of the presence and the angels of holiness are circumcised (*Jub.* 15:27). The significance of these two classes of circumcised angels is that not only does the priesthood have a heavenly counterpart in the angels of the presence, the whole of Israel corresponds to the angels of holiness. In this respect, Himmelfarb notes *Jubilees*' unique character in comparison to contemporary texts: "Jubilees claims that it is not extraordinary righteous heroes of the past or members of a sectarian elite but the entire Jewish people that is like the angels."⁵⁹

The second significant passage for the identity of the elect clarifies that only one of Abraham's descendants will enjoy covenant membership. After affirming that all of Abraham's sons will become nations, *Jub.* 16:17–18 narrows down the covenant members:

But one of Isaac's sons would become a holy progeny and would not be numbered among the nations, for he would become the share of the Most High. All his descendants had fallen into that (share) which God owns so that they would become a people whom the Lord *possesses* out of all the nations; and that they would become a kingdom, a priesthood, and a holy people. (Italics original, underline mine)

There are a couple of significant observations to be pointed out regarding this passage. First, the emphasis here is not on Isaac as much as it is on "one of Isaac's sons," that is Jacob. Second, *all* of the descendants of Jacob are chosen as God's possession. So, the elect are neither all of Abraham's descendants nor all of Isaac's, but *Jacob* and all of his descendants will enjoy the covenant with God.⁶⁰

⁵⁹ Martha Himmelfarb, "The Book of Jubilees and Early Jewish Mysticism," in *Enoch and the Mosaic Torah: The Evidence of Jubilees*, ed. Gabriele Boccaccini and Giovanni Ibba (Grand Rapids, Mich.: Eerdmans, 2009), 392; Martha Himmelfarb, "Jubilees' Kingdom of Priests," in *A Kingdom of Priests: Ancestry and Merit in Ancient Judaism*, Jewish Culture and Contexts (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2011), 53–84.

⁶⁰ Jacob's election more generally is reiterated in *Jub.* 22:10–11, 23–24; 25:22.

3.3.2 MORAL CORRESPONDENCE TO THE ELECT STATUS

The author attempts to make clear the implicit rationale of the biblical narrative's choice of covenant members, particularly with respect to Abraham and Jacob. *Jubilees* portrays Abraham as a righteous individual who is faithful in the midst of testing and stands out among his generation. The line of worshippers of God from Adam through Enoch and Noah re-reemerges with Abraham (*Jub.* 6:18). In *Jubilees*, as in Genesis, God calls Abram out of his homeland and promises him a land, a nation of descendants, a great name, and that he will be both blessed and a blessing to the nations of the earth (*Jub.* 12:22–24; cf. Gen. 12:1–3). In contrast to Genesis, in which God's promises given to Abram come suddenly in the narrative, *Jubilees* has inserted extensive additions to Abram's early life. These additions serve to demonstrate that Abram's call to covenant relationship corresponded to his righteous life style. Abram is depicted in contrast to the wicked among Shem's lineage (*Jub.* 8:1–4; cf. 7:18), as well as to the idolatry of his father and brother (*Jub.* 11:16; 12:1–8; 12:12–14). In connection with his rejection of idolatry, *Jub.* 11:11–24 pictures Abram as a successful combatant with the demonic powers of Mastema. Indeed, God's promises to Abram immediately follow Abram's rejection of astrology and cry to the God of creation (12:16–21).

The early years of Abram in Chaldea are matched in the narration of Abraham's later life. *Jubilees* introduces the idea of ten tests of Abraham's faithfulness that are absent from the Genesis narrative. As in the narratives of Abram's early life in *Jubilees*, these tests of faithfulness are set up as a struggle between Abraham and Mastema. For example, the Aqedah is introduced in *Jubilees* with a Job-like scene in which Prince Mastema enters before God desiring to try Abraham's faithfulness by attacking his son Isaac (*Jub.* 17:15–18). The series of tests concludes with Abraham's tenth test of patiently pleading for a plot of land in order to bury Sarah (*Jub.* 19:8–9). The point for *Jubilees* is that Abraham was faithful to

the God who created him and not to false idols (*Jub.* 21:2–4). Francis Watson correctly describes *Jubilees*’ understanding the patriarch: “the life of Abraham is read as a series of occasions for the display of his faithfulness.”⁶¹

Jubilees also contains lengthy additions to demonstrate Jacob’s moral character. As I mentioned above, *Jub.* 15:30 implies that God drew Jacob near to himself because he knew of his moral quality beforehand. This plays out in the narrative from the very beginning of the boys’ lives:

Jacob was perfect and upright, while Esau was a harsh, rustic, and hairy man. Jacob used to live in tents. When the boys grew up, Jacob learned (the art of) writing, but Esau did not learn (it) because he was a rustic man and a hunter. He learned (the art of) warfare, and everything that he did was harsh. Abraham loved Jacob but Isaac (loved) Esau.

Jacob is portrayed as “perfect and upright,” embodying the author’s ideals with a special emphasis on literacy.⁶² While in Genesis Jacob blatantly lied to Isaac (“I am Esau your firstborn”; Gen 27:19, cf. v. 24), in *Jubilees* he *technically* tells his father the truth (“I am your son”; *Jub.* 26:13, 19).⁶³ As in Genesis, Rebecca bitterly complained that Esau married Canaanite women so she sent Jacob away to marry someone from her father’s household (*Jub.* 25:1–10; Gen. 27:46–28:5). *Jubilees*, however, includes the additional information that Esau had been pressuring Jacob to marry a Canaanite woman for the previous 22 years. While Esau abandoned his elderly parents to marry a daughter of Ishmael at Mt. Seir, Jacob moved back from Laban and supplied Isaac and Rebecca with food, supplies, and all they needed (*Jub.* 29:14–20). Finally, despite repeated requests from their parents not to quarrel (*Jub.* 35:9, 18–27; 36:4), Esau’s sons persuade him to try to attack and to attempt to murder

⁶¹ Watson, *Hermeneutics*, 202–213.

⁶² Moreover, while *Jubilees* does not appear averse to violence (cf. *Jub.* 30), it is Esau’s penchant for warfare which proves to be his downfall later in the narrative (37–38).

⁶³ David N. DeJong, “The Decline of Human Longevity in the Book of Jubilees,” *JSP* 21.4 (2012): 358.

Jacob (*Jub.* 37:1–24). In contrast, Jacob resists the conflict with his brother until it is inevitable (*Jub.* 37:24–25; 38:1). Thus, for *Jubilees*, Jacob’s moral character corresponds to his covenant membership in a similar manner as Abraham.

Moreover, other characters within the narrative recognize those chosen for covenant relationship by their morality. Concerning Jacob, Abraham is the first to discern that he will be the covenant representative based on his actions in *Jub.* 19:16: “As Abraham observed Esau’s behavior, he realized that through Jacob he would have a reputation and descendants.” Isaac, too, will eventually come to recognize that Jacob will be the covenant representative rather than his beloved Esau, though Isaac’s realization is much delayed compared to Abraham and Rebecca. Nevertheless, towards the end of Isaac and Rebecca’s lives he concedes that his earlier judgment concerning the two sons was wrong:

Isaac said to her, “I, too, know and see the actions of Jacob who is with us—that he wholeheartedly honors us. At first I did love Esau more than Jacob, after he was born; but now I love Jacob more than Esau because he has done so many bad things and lacks (the ability to do) what is right. For the entire way he acts is (characterized by) injustice and violence and there is no justice about him.” (*Jub.* 35:13)

For the author of *Jubilees*, the election of a person is closely connected to the behavior of a person. One should be cautious in asserting a causal relationship between righteousness and election because the author’s clear conviction is that these events are recorded on the heavenly tablets. Nevertheless, it remains clear that the author believes righteous living properly corresponds to election to the covenant.

3.4 CONCLUSION: ISRAEL’S ELECT STATUS IN *JUBILEES*

I have been exploring *Jubilees*’ use of divine sonship language as well as the themes interconnected with the motif. The previous chapter demonstrates that Israel’s divine sonship and primogeniture language designated them as the people chosen for covenant relationship

with God. In this chapter, I have examined the nature of Israel's election. *Jubilees* demonstrates a particular emphasis on a written tradition containing divine revelation from the heavenly tablets that marks out those chosen for covenant membership. *Jubilees* presents itself as standing in this line of written divine knowledge. I subsequently explored two aspects of the content contained within the written tradition: information on the calendar and geography. The revealed knowledge concerning the sabbath, the Festival of Weeks, and the jubilees allowed the covenant people to synchronize their worship with the angelic worship in heaven. Further, the knowledge concerning geography revealed that the covenant people had inherited the holiest locations on earth, that is, where the divine presence dwelt. In other words, the revealed knowledge contained in the written tradition enabled Israel to live out their elect status as those who worship the Creator in his presence, a status built into the fabric of the cosmos since creation. In the next chapter, I explore how Israel's status as covenant people affects the rest of creation in the thought of *Jubilees*.

It is important to highlight that the revealed knowledge from the heavenly tablets enabled the covenant people to fulfill the covenant stipulations and, consequently, fulfill their role in creation. For the author of *Jubilees*, the heavenly tablets provided the hermeneutical key for the proper interpretation of Israel's history and Israel's scriptures. Those chosen for covenant relationship with God were privileged with special divine knowledge concerning the hidden spatial-temporal realities of the cosmos. When Israel lived faithfully to the covenant stipulations, particularly with respect to the calendar, they acted in accordance with these cosmological realities. Thus, divine revelation of the proper calendar opens the way for the restoration of the covenant, which was described in *Jub.* 1. The Lord imposed the covenantal curses, in part, because Israel erred regarding the calendar (*Jub.* 1:14). In order for

Israel to return to the Lord (*Jub.* 1:15), divine revelation is required to correct this calendrical error.

It is significant to note here that while the author of *Jubilees* operates with hermeneutical freedom to a certain extent, the biblical narrative establishes definite limitations and boundaries. For example, the covenantal line must move through Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob. Yet, the author offers his own rationale or implicit logic that explains the received biblical narrative. The author of *Jubilees* is interested in demonstrating the link between moral virtue and the status of the elect. I have been careful to avoid the language that election is *based* on righteousness. For the author, God chose Israel from the week of creation. Nevertheless, there are lengthy additions that emphasize the moral worthiness of Abram and Jacob.

Finally, just as the divine presence was intimately linked with the discussion of the covenant, so it is with election. God has chosen a certain line of humanity to draw near to himself (*Jub.* 15:30). Israel enjoys God's presence in their land inheritance and mirrors the activity of the heavenly angelic worship when the people follow the proper calendar. This type of alignment with the heavenly cult bears remarkable resemblances to the type of speculation in the *Songs of the Sabbath Sacrifice*. Thus, because of Israel's inheritance of the locations on earth where God's presence had been revealed and because of their knowledge of the heavenly calendar, Israel could properly draw near to the presence of God. Earlier I showed that the eschatological, visible presence of God would authenticate the identity of the sons of God in the future. In this chapter, I have shown that the nearness of God is not merely an eschatological expectation but a reality that Israel lives in when they are Torah observant dwelling in their inheritance.

THE SONS OF GOD, COVENANT RESTORATION, AND ESCHATOLOGY

I have demonstrated that divine sonship language in *Jubilees* describes the group chosen for covenant relationship with the God of creation. This led into a discussion about the nature of election as conceived in *Jubilees*. I argued that the election of Israel as the covenant people was built into the spatial-temporal reality of the created order. Geographically, Israel's land inheritance, which contained the three holiest locations on earth and was considered God's special possession, corresponded with the holy nature of the people of Israel who were also God's special possession. In the temporal dimension, Israel alone among the nations was chosen to participate in the sabbath and the calendar of feasts, both of which correspond with the heavenly liturgy. The elect are also marked out by the reception of a written tradition that originated from the heavenly tablets. This tradition was passed down through Enoch, Noah, Abraham, Jacob, and Levi, and recorded by Moses in the "law and the testimony," thus enabling Israel to have a priesthood and to be a holy people.

Given that Israel's election is embedded in the spatial-temporal reality of the cosmos, the present chapter seeks to elucidate the relationship between election to the covenant and *Jubilees'* eschatological vision. In other words, I consider how the restoration of the sons of God is connected to the new creation and the divine presence indwelling that renewed creation. In what follows, I argue that *Jubilees* views the restoration of the covenant people as the triggering event that will culminate in the restoration of all creation. The influence of the sons of God over the entire created order is in accordance with their elect status built into the

created order. The covenant people's influence over the rest of creation can be seen, on the one hand, in their infidelity creating disorder and chaos. On the other hand, Israel's renewal and restoration leads to renewed creation. I establish the overall picture of *Jubilees*' eschatological expectation through an examination of the most extensive passages relating to eschatology in *Jub.* 1 and 23. Subsequently, I draw out shorter texts that pertain to the eschatological period in order to develop further the picture of the relationship between the elect and new creation.

4.1 DEFINING ESCHATOLOGY

Before I turn directly to the passages, however, a word is necessary on how the term “eschatology” is being conceived. Lexically, of course, the Greek term ἔσχατον has been used to signify the topic of “last things.” The term becomes more complicated because different texts require various modifiers, such as *realized*, *futurist*, or *inaugurated*, in order to accurately describe each author's vision of the relationship between the present and future events.¹ Working with *Jubilees* in particular, Davenport offers a broad definition of eschatology open to “any view of the future in which there are events anticipated as having significance for the life of Israel and the world, events beyond which life will be significantly different.”² The difficulty with Davenport's definition, however, is that the “eschatological” passages he deals with, while certainly containing future-oriented aspects, often draw on the entire sweep of human history. That is, *Jubilees* derives the future-oriented visions from its

¹ For a similar discussion, Grant Macaskill, *Revealed Wisdom and Inaugurated Eschatology in Ancient Judaism and Early Christianity* (Leiden: Brill, 2007), 24–25.

² With the broader definition, Davenport can include under consideration both *prophetic eschatology* (entailing destruction of Israel's enemies, restored kingship, and a golden age of peace and prosperity) and *apocalyptic eschatology* (entailing a dualistic view of the end of the present world, destruction of cosmic forces threatening man, resurrection of the dead, and an emphasis on life for the individual man); thereby he attempts to identify the redactional layers of the work; *Eschatology*, 5–8.

retelling of primordial and patriarchal history because events from the distant past carry significant import for the author's view of the future.

Moreover, while the restoration of the covenant and the full blessings of the final age may both be future from the author's perspective, I demonstrate below that these distinct events are separated *from each other* by a lengthy period of time. Indeed, as Davenport comments on *Jub.* 1:22, the "indictment includes a call to confession, a call hardly intended for any generation other than the author's own."³ In contrast, the culmination of the eschatological events occurs only after a long time period. The temporally near event of covenant restoration (from the author's point of view) is causally connected to the final states of new creation and God's dwelling on Zion as King; thus, the restoration is often subsumed under the description "eschatological," even though it is not pictured in *Jubilees* as an "end of time" event.

Because of these caveats, the present discussion draws on passages that, strictly speaking, are beyond the purview of "future events." The restoration of the covenant and the final state of the cosmos are temporally discrete events that are, nevertheless, causally linked. The restoration triggers the process leading toward the renewed creation; in this sense, if the restored covenant is linked with contemporary events (e.g. the Maccabean revolt), then *Jubilees'* eschatology may accurately be labeled *inaugurated*. Moreover, because the *Urzeit* and *Endzeit* are so closely correlated in *Jubilees*, and because the rewriting of Genesis and Exodus naturally invests significant space to the primeval and patriarchal eras, investigating *Jubilees'* eschatology involves significant study of its protology. Thus, I broaden my treatment of *Jubilees'* eschatology to include events which are future-oriented even though they may in fact be from the author's ancient past.

³ Davenport, *Eschatology*, 27.

4.2 RESTORATION AND ESCHATOLOGY IN *JUBILEES* 1 AND 23

I turn now to an examination of the two primary passages for eschatological material in *Jub.* 1 and 23. I analyze each chapter separately to discern its individual contribution to the eschatological vision. Subsequently, I synthesize the results into one eschatological scheme, a move that requires some critical evaluation of Gene Davenport's form and redaction critical study.

4.2.1 *JUBILEES* 1: COVENANT RESTORATION AS THE CENTER OF THE CREATION-NEW CREATION SCHEME

Jubilees 1 follows a covenantal pattern of sin (vv. 7–12, 22), exile (vv. 13–14), repentance (vv. 15–16, 23), and restoration (vv. 17, 23–25). The chapter draws heavily on Deut 30–31 for its language to describe Israel's future trajectory. Because of its prominence as the opening chapter in *Jubilees*, the covenantal pattern becomes the lens through which the reader understands the creation narrative (*Jub.* 2), and so it provides the proper context for understanding the world and its events. The whole of the world's history from beginning to end, creation to new creation, finds its high point with the Temple restored on Mt. Zion and God ruling from it (*Jub.* 1:27–29), producing an Israel-oriented trajectory of world history. Reaching this eschatological state presupposes that Israel has already gone through the Deuteronomic process of sin, exile, and restoration. Thus, more than being Israel-oriented in trajectory, world history is Israel-centered because Israel's repentance and restoration is the

hinge-event that reverses the course of the cosmos.⁴ For the author of *Jubilees*, the history of the world is marked by the covenantal pattern found in the closing chapters of Deuteronomy.

In the eschatological vision of *Jub.* 1, Israel's return to God with her whole being triggers her deliverance from the covenantal curses and her restoration to covenantal blessings. In the language of Deut 4:29–30 and 30:1–10, *Jub.* 1:15 states that “Israel will return to God with all their minds, souls, and all their strength.”⁵ In response to Israel's whole-hearted searching, God allows himself to be found and further discloses peace to Israel. The need for some change originating within Israel is again emphasized in 1:22. After Moses unsuccessfully attempts to intercede on behalf of Israel (vv. 19–21), the Lord explains to Moses, “I know their contrary nature, their way of thinking, and their stubbornness. They will not listen until they acknowledge their sins and the sins of their ancestors.” It is only after this recognition of sin in the midst of covenantal punishment that Israel will return to God in a “fully upright manner with all (their) minds and all (their souls)” (v. 23).

God, in turn, will respond to Israel by effecting a change in the covenant people that will enable them to be perpetually faithful to God's commands. As I discussed in §2.2.1.1, *Jub.* 1:23–25 describes God's actions with three “I will” statements. First, God will “cut

⁴ Scott, *On Earth as in Heaven*, 80: “The focus of world history, which spans from creation to the new creation, is on Israel, and particularly on the restoration of Israel.”

⁵ David Lambert argues that *Jubilees* emphasizes the divine change of nature within Israel rather than Israel's repentance. His argument begins from the observation that in the two repentance passages of Deut 4:29–30 and 30:1–10, the former prioritizes human initiative while the latter prioritizes divine initiative. For Lambert, *Jubilees* solves the exegetical problem by inserting Moses' intercession: Israel will need to repent (*Jub.* 1:15–18, like Deut 4:29–30); Moses asks for a new nature for Israel to avoid the covenant punishment (*Jub.* 1:19–21); God partially concedes to Moses by agreeing to give Israel a new nature (*Jub.* 1:22–25, like Deut 30:1–10), but only after the covenantal cycle. Lambert then appeals to the “general drift of *Jubilees*' exegesis,” with the author inheriting the “paradigm of sin-exile-repentance-redemption from the Book of Deuteronomy,” but modifying it to reflect the “divine-circumcision-of-the-heart language of Deut 30:1–10”; Lambert, “Did Israel Believe,” 637–639. Lambert's observations are helpful; however, it is doubtful the author would have separated Deut 4 from Deut 30 so strongly. Indeed, even Deut 30:1–2 appears to begin with Israel's repentance that is answered by the divine response, making the reconciliation of these two texts from Deuteronomy a relatively easy matter. In this regard, Hubbard observes the parallels in Jeremiah and Ezekiel of internal renovation by God, as Lambert, but he rightly distinguishes *Jubilees* from the prophets because of its optimism concerning Israel's ability to repent; *New Creation*, 45.

away the foreskins of their minds” breaking the stubbornness of the covenant people (cf. Deut 30:6; Jer 4:4; 9:25–26). Second, God will “create a holy spirit for them and purify them” so as to ensure Israel will perform his commandments. Third, God says, “I will become their father and they will become my children.” I noted earlier that for *Jubilees* Israel’s filial relationship with God as the covenant-elect people was established during the week of creation. So this aspect of God’s action on behalf of Israel should be understood as restoration to their previous status. In contrast, the internal circumcision and dispensing of a holy spirit appears to be a new change. The circumcision of the mind breaks the stubbornness experienced in exile and the holy spirit enables the performance of the commandments. Thus, the changes effected after the restoration ensure covenant faithfulness and that another round of sin and exile will not recur.

With the faithfulness of the covenant people ensured, *Jub.* 1:26–29 provides the author’s description of the final state, which is characterized by the presence of God, the purity of Mt. Zion, and the new creation.⁶ These descriptions are contained in three statements of the comprehensive range of material covered by the “law and the testimony.” The significance for our discussion is the terminal point described in each. First, in *Jub.* 1:26, God tells Moses to record all the words concerning “what is first and what is last and what is to come during all the divisions of time...until eternity.” This terminus is then further specified with the eschatological event: “until the time when I descend and live with them throughout all the ages of eternity.”⁷ In the second passage, *Jub.* 1:27–28, God orders the Angel of the Presence to dictate the events from creation until the building of God’s temple, which will remain until eternity. He describes the culmination as follows:

⁶ Scott, *On Earth As In Heaven*, 79–82.

⁷ Davenport, *Eschatology*, 28–29.

The Lord will appear in the sight of all, and all will know that I am the God of Israel, the father of all Jacob's children, and the king on Mt. Zion for the ages of eternity. Then Zion and Jerusalem will become holy. (*Jub.* 1:28)

As in v. 26, vv. 27–28 associate the final state with the visible presence of the Lord with the additional elements of the vindication of Israel's filial relationship to God and the Lord reigning as king from Mt. Zion.

Third, in *Jub.* 1:29, the time period of events contained on the tablets from which the angel dictates is described in this way:

from the time the law and the testimony were created—for the weeks of their jubilees, year by year in their full number, and their jubilees from [the time of the creation until] the time of the new creation when the heavens, the earth, and all their creatures will be renewed like the powers of the sky and like all the creatures of the earth, until the time when the temple of the Lord will be created in Jerusalem on Mt. Zion. (*Jub.* 1:29)⁸

The tablets speak of the years “in their full number,” that is all of history until the time of the renewing of heaven, earth, and all that lives therein. The author of *Jubilees* evokes the language of new creation found in Isa 65:17; 66:22, then links this with the establishment of the temple on Mt. Zion. Two shared elements link together v. 26, vv. 27–28, and v. 29: they each describe the full range of history, and they each culminate with the divine presence.

⁸ There are, however, significant textual issues with this verse. As indicated by the brackets, the phrase “the time of creation until” is an emendation by VanderKam away from the Ethiopic text, which indicates that *Jubilees*' account starts from the new creation onward. VanderKam correctly notes the context implies a range from creation to new creation; *The Book of Jubilees*, 6 n. 1:29. The emendation follows Michael E Stone, “Apocryphal Notes and Readings,” in *Israel Oriental Studies*, vol. 1 of (Tel Aviv: Tel Aviv University, 1971), 125–126. Stone suggests a scribe could have skipped from the first “the day” to the second by homoeoteleuton if the original was “from [the day of creation until] the day of the new creation.” This is a sensible reconstruction, especially within the context, and it is also followed by Orval S. Wintermute, “Jubilees: A New Translation and Introduction,” in *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha*, ed. James H. Charlesworth, vol. 2 of (New York: Doubleday, 1985), 54 n. 1. Hanneken, however, resists the emendation and prefers to read the “renewing” of the heavens, the earth, and the creatures at “multiple levels,” i.e., the original creation of Gen 1 was a renewing of creation, in another sense the priestly cult of Aaron also has cosmic significance for atonement and renewal, and finally the eschatological future relative to the audience will also be a renewal (*The Subversion of the Apocalypses in the Book of Jubilees* (Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2012), 176–178). This is an intriguing suggestion, but the immediate context suggests a restatement of a range of time in apposition to the previous statement “from the time the law and the testimony...from [the time of creation until].” The scribal error proposed by Stone is plausible and I accept it.

Not all commentators agree that *Jub.* 1:26–29 describes the time range from creation to new creation.⁹ Hanneken reads the primary referent in this text as the filling of the original tabernacle completed “in the days of Moses, in the distant past for the original audience.”¹⁰ Hanneken contends that if *Jub.* 1:26–29 describes the range of content of *Jubilees* itself, one should note that “the book covers from the creation up to (not through) the building and indwelling of the sanctuary of God in the midst of Israel,” that is “*Jubilees* narrates the time from creation through Exod 24.”¹¹ Hanneken does acknowledge that the passage contains “an eschatological, permanent dimension,” but this merely “adds to but does not negate the basic sense.”¹² Anticipating the objection that the original filling of the tabernacle was not permanent, he explains, “it is true that the sanctuary built among Israel in Exod 25–Lev 9 did not persist uninterrupted for eternity, but it was planned for eternity, and the same basic plan will become stable for eternity.”¹³

Hanneken’s reading helpfully elucidates the connection between the building of the tabernacle and the eschaton. In his words, “[t]he building of the sanctuary has two temporal meanings: the simple sense of the time of Exod 25, and the permanent sense future relative to the audience.”¹⁴ Ultimately, however, *Jub.* 1:26–29 should be read as eschatological. First and most significantly, Hanneken must read the “eternal” language applied to the indwelling

⁹ While I will primarily deal with Hanneken’s more developed argument here, Kugel also reads *Jub.* 1:26–29 as the initial indwelling of the tabernacle in Exodus, Kugel, *A Walk*, 25–28.

¹⁰ Hanneken, *Subversion*, 174.

¹¹ Hanneken, *Subversion*, 174–175.

¹² Hanneken, *Subversion*, 175.

¹³ Hanneken, *Subversion*, 176.

¹⁴ Hanneken, *Subversion*, 176. The ambivalent nature of the language can be seen in that Wintermute associates the language of the Lord’s appearing in *Jub.* 1:28 with the exodus in Exod 24:10 (“*Jubilees*: A New Translation and Introduction,” 2:54), while Davenport associates it with the eschatological second exodus in Isa 40:5 (*Eschatology*, 30).

of the tabernacle as the desired, but unrealized intention. It is improbable that the author would view words recorded on the heavenly tablets as unattained intentions. Second, the location specified is Mt. Zion and Jerusalem, not Sinai. While Hanneken is correct to say the addition of Zion “does not negate the connection to the immediate fulfillment,” *Jub.* 1:26–29 likely refers primarily to the permanent, eschatological Temple on Mt. Zion.

The eschatological vision of *Jub.* 1:26–29 is only one aspect of the author’s vision of the whole history of creation from beginning to end. This Israel-shaped trajectory of world history traces the deuteronomic pattern of sin, exile, repentance, and restoration. The center of the deuteronomic pattern is Israel’s repentance and restoration, but the author of *Jubilees* reframed this pattern between creation and new creation. In other words, the author’s view of history starts with Gen 1–2, centers on Deut 31, and culminates with Isa 65–66. Thus, Israel’s repentance is not merely the center of Israel’s history but of the world’s. In this way, the author can organically connect Israel’s repentance to the eschatological expectation of new creation and God’s dwelling on Mt. Zion.

There are a couple of important elements to note before moving on. First, in the end of *Jub.* 1:29, the luminaries are being renewed “for the (purpose of) healing, health, and blessing for all the elect ones of Israel,” a motif connecting the restoration of the covenant people and the restoration of creation, which I continue to draw out throughout this chapter. Second, *Jub.* 1 does not clarify the temporal relationship between Israel’s repentance and the culmination of the eschatological vision. Although both the covenant restoration and descriptions of the final state await Israel’s turning back to the Lord, there is an undefined period of time between the restored covenant and renewed creation. The author’s full eschatological vision is telescoped in *Jub.* 1. In this way, *Jub.* 23 serves as a complementary chapter that fills in chronological details in the eschatological vision.

4.2.2 JUBILEES 23: HUMAN LIFE SPANS AND RESTORED CREATION

The other main section of *Jubilees* commonly associated with eschatological themes is *Jub.* 23:8–31.¹⁵ Precision is required, however, when one applies the term “eschatological” to this text, which does not necessarily describe the “final state” of the cosmos. *Jubilees* 23 is certainly connected to the eschatological expectation and possibly describes an inaugurated eschatology; however, it may be more properly termed a *restoration eschatological* text in the sense that Israel’s repentance within the covenantal pattern is pictured rather than the final state. This difference becomes clear when one considers a key distinction between *Jub.* 1 and *Jub.* 23: in the latter, there is no mention of the new creation,¹⁶ purified temple, or the dwelling of the presence of God. The chapter envisages a return to the law, a reversal of the cosmos’s progressive decline, and a gradual restoration. But the climactic events pictured in *Jub.* 1:26–29 are not explicitly picked up *Jub.* 23. The resulting era is characterized by the absence of a satan or anyone who will destroy, resulting in times of blessing and healing in *Jub.* 23:29. This description, however, does not necessarily identify a final state for *Jubilees*, as similar language is used of Egypt under Joseph’s rule (*Jub.* 40:9; 46:2). So, *Jub.* 23, from the narrative perspective of Moses on Sinai, primarily describes the events surrounding the restoration of the covenant that will *eventually* lead to the final state.¹⁷

¹⁵ *Jubilees* 23:8–31 has also been identified as *Jubilees*’ apocalypse because of the shared elements with *1 Enoch* and *Daniel*; Endres, *Biblical Interpretation*, 53; James Kugel, “The Jubilees Apocalypse,” *DSD* 1 (1994): 322–37.

¹⁶ Hubbard, noting the similarity in structure between the two chapters, suggests that *Jub.* 23 serves as a commentary on the “new creation” of *Jub.* 1, despite the absence of the phrase in *Jub.* 23; Hubbard, *New Creation*, 39. As will become evident, I largely agree with this assessment.

¹⁷ The more difficult question, however, is when this turning to the law occurs with respect the writing of *Jubilees*. Does the author believe the turn has occurred and he is living in the gradual restoration, in which case we have an inaugurated eschatology, or does the author still look forward to this turning?

Though the passage is not eschatological in the same sense as the opening chapter, both *Jub.* 1 and *Jub.* 23 share the covenant pattern of sin, punishment, and restoration. Various woes and natural disasters are described as punishment for sin on a certain “evil generation” in *Jub.* 23:12–14. Later in the chapter, God is depicted as handing that generation over to “sword, judgment, captivity, plundering, and devouring” (*Jub.* 23:22), evoking the Deuteronomic covenantal curses. The transgressions are later unpacked in *Jub.* 23:16 as “abandoning the covenant” and forsaking his commandments, ordinances, and laws. Then, in *Jub.* 23:19, the author emphasizes that Israel’s forsaking of sacred times is one of the causes for the punishment: “For they have forgotten commandment, covenant, festival, month, sabbath, jubilee, and every verdict.” Thus, it is no surprise that the covenantal sin and punishment is remedied with a return to covenantal faithfulness, that is, “to study the laws, to seek out the commands, and to return to the right way” (*Jub.* 23:16).

New elements are introduced to the covenantal pattern in *Jub.* 23, however. In particular, Israel’s “sexual impurity, contamination, and their detestable actions” will have dramatic ramifications not just for the nation but for the earth (*Jub.* 23:14). The impact on the wider cosmos is further described in *Jub.* 23:18:

The earth will indeed be destroyed because of all that they do. There will be no produce from the vine and no oil because what they do (constitutes) complete disobedience. All will be destroyed together—animals, cattle, birds, and all fish of the sea—because of mankind. (*Jub.* 23:18)

The author of *Jubilees* clearly understands there to be a causal connection between the sins of humanity and the destruction of earth. In the Genesis account of creation, after making the heavens, seas, and earth, God created the fish to fill the seas and the birds to fill the skies on the fifth day. Next, God created the cattle and animals to fill the land on the sixth day. All of this, of course, culminates with the creation of humanity (Gen 1:20–27). *Jubilees* describes

the de-creation movement of *Jub.* 23 in the reverse order with humanity causing the destruction of the animals, cattle, birds, fish, and even the earth. The “evil generation” has contributed in its own way to the decline of creation. While Adam and Eve’s sin had negative effects on the created order for *Jubilees*, the sins of subsequent generations will also have a negative impact on the cosmos.

The connection is more specific than general human wickedness and its effects on the cosmos. *Jubilees* 23 pictures the *covenant unfaithfulness* of Israel as the cause of the breakdown in nature.¹⁸ In vv. 16–17, *Jubilees* describes children complaining against their fathers and elders that they have abandoned the covenant and failed to “observe and perform all [God’s] commands, ordinances, and all his laws.” This covenant unfaithfulness described in vv. 16–17 is the immediate cause for the breakdown of creation in v. 18. Then, after the description of nature’s corruption, covenant unfaithfulness is again emphasized:

One group will struggle with another—the young with the old, the old with the young; the poor with the rich, the lowly with the great; and the needy with the ruler—regarding the law and the covenant. For they have forgotten commandment, covenant, festival, month, sabbath, jubilee, and every verdict. (*Jub.* 23:19)

Despite the fact that v. 18 indicts the general category of “mankind,”¹⁹ it is clear from the causal statements juxtaposed on either side that this level of influence over creation is only possessed by those chosen for covenant relationship. The privileges of the commandments, sabbaths, and festivals have been given to Israel alone and, therefore, Israel alone can be culpable for forgetting them.

¹⁸ Hanneken makes the same point in his argument that the “final woes” are the just chastisement prescribed by the covenant by showing the connection to Deut 28 and Lev 26, *Subversion*, 136–138. See also Harry Alan Hahne, *The Corruption and Redemption of Creation: Nature in Romans 8.19-22 and Jewish Apocalyptic Literature*, LNTS 336 (London: T & T Clark, 2006), 71–72.

¹⁹ Endres suggests that the author alludes to the Noah story “as a primordial example of the effects of sin”; *Biblical Interpretation*, 54. This may provide explanation as to why the general term “mankind” is used when the context demands specifically covenantal members.

The general decline of creation is vividly captured in the specific decline of human life span in *Jub. 23*.²⁰ *Jubilees* harkens back to the patriarchal period when life spans were 19 jubilees (v. 9), and the quality of those nearly 1000 year lives was good (v. 15). The biblical material on the patriarchs demonstrates how human longevity was in decline,²¹ but *Jubilees* explicitly extends this trend beyond the flood with human life expectancy continuing to decrease and life becoming more difficult (v. 9). Within this general decline, Abraham is highlighted as a special case because he was “perfect with the Lord in everything that he did”; yet, even righteous Abraham did not complete four jubilees (v. 10). This gradual descent progressed until the “evil generation” who will only live for one and a half jubilees, and these 70 to 80 years will be characterized by difficulties, toil, and distress without peace (vv. 12–13, 15).²² *Jubilees* has taken the more general statement of the human condition of Ps 90:9–10 and re-appropriated it as the punishment of the coming “evil generation.”²³ The nadir is described with the extreme images of *Jub. 23:25*: “The children’s heads will turn white with gray hair. A child who is three weeks of age will look old like one whose years are 100,

²⁰ Hanneken labels human life span the “barometer of the decline of history”; *Subversion*, 125–127; Scott, *On Earth As In Heaven*, 107–110; Hahne, *Corruption and Redemption*, 72–73. DeJong discusses premature death, both sudden and gradual decline in lifespan, as divine retributive justice for sin. He provides the death notices of Adam (4:29–30), Cain (4:31), Haran (12:12–14), and Esau (37–38) as evidence in addition to *Jub. 23*; DeJong, “The Decline of Human Longevity in the Book of Jubilees,” 353–357.

²¹ Scott, *On Earth As In Heaven*, 107–119. Scott demonstrates that *Jubilees* shows greater affinity to the proto-SP rather than the proto-MT because the former allows for a more gradual decline in patriarchal ages and, thus, better supports the author’s argument.

²² Scott observes that even Moses’ reception of the Torah did not affect this general trend as *Jub. 23:11* indicates: “All the generations that will come into being from now [i.e. the time Moses received the Torah on Sinai] until the great day of judgment....” *On Earth As In Heaven*, 113–114.

²³ Kugel, “The Jubilees Apocalypse,” 331.

and their condition will be destroyed through distress.”²⁴ These images appear to be the exact reverse of the images of the restoration of creation in Isa 65:20.²⁵

The restoration of the created order described in *Jub.* 23 is a gradual process that mirrors the gradual decline of creation.²⁶ The crucial turning point begins with children rejecting the sins of their fathers and reinitiating covenant faithfulness through the study of Torah according to *Jub.* 23:26: “In those days the children will begin to study the laws, to seek out the commands, and to return to the right way.” The result of this return to Torah is that human life spans will once again approach 1000 years and even exceed the longevity of the patriarchs. This increase, however, will not occur immediately but “generation by generation and day by day” (v. 27). Moreover, the years experienced by humanity will be good years characterized by peace and joy (v. 29).

Jubilees 23, like *Jub.* 1, is a presentation of world history in the covenantal pattern that turns on Israel’s repentance and return to Torah. But, here the author explicitly ties the covenantal unfaithfulness of “that evil generation” to the deterioration of the cosmos. The low point brought on by the “evil generation” is the culmination of a gradual process. This is evident in the way that the author links the decline of the human life span to the decline of creation. The recovery of human life span is explicitly described as a gradual process, justifying the understanding of the restoration of the wider creation as following a similar gradual process. There are two noticeable omissions in *Jub.* 23 that a reader of *Jubilees* might have expected to find, especially in light of our study of *Jub.* 1. First, in a work that so often

²⁴ Scott, *On Earth As In Heaven*, 119.

²⁵ DeJong, “The Decline of Human Longevity in the Book of Jubilees,” 356.

²⁶ See especially, Scott, *On Earth As In Heaven*, 119–143. For discussion of *Jubilees*’ contrasting description of a gradual restoration as compared to other similar Second Temple literature, Hanneken, *Subversion*, 125–127; Hahne, *Corruption and Redemption*, 77–81.

dates events by their week and jubilee after creation, the chronology of the restoration and the gradual recovery are left undefined. Second, while I have shown that the covenantal pattern of Israel has significant ramifications for the created order, there is no mention of the end points of creation or new creation. Therefore, *Jub.* 1 and 23 serve to describe *Jubilees* eschatological vision in a complementary fashion. *Jubilees* 1 links the restoration of the covenant to the culmination of history in the new creation, while *Jub.* 23 describes the gradual changes before and after the restoration.

4.2.3 SYNTHESIS OF *JUBILEES* 1 AND 23

At this point, it will be beneficial to bring together the material from *Jub.* 1 and *Jub.* 23 into a unified scheme. A synthesis of the material from the two chapters, however, must be justified in light of Davenport's form and redaction critical study of these passages, which attributes portions of the chapters to two different redactors of the original author's composition. Davenport concludes that *Jub.* 1:4b–26 and *Jub.* 23:14–20, 22–31 are additions from a second edition (labeled R₁ by Davenport) produced under Hasmonean rule, while *Jub.* 1:27–28 and *Jub.* 23:11 come from a “sanctuary-oriented” redaction (labeled R₂) produced at Qumran sometime between 140–104 B.C.E.²⁷ As is clear from Davenport's dating, as well as our earlier arguments that the final form of *Jubilees* is a second century B.C.E. writing, the literary development of these chapters does not affect our comparison with Paul's thought. If, however, Davenport is correct to see redactional layers in the key chapters of *Jub.* 1 and 23, then one may need to exercise more caution while synthesizing the outlooks of the two chapters.

²⁷ Davenport, *Eschatology*, 10–18.

The notable point is that, even in Davenport's scheme, most of the eschatological material from *Jub.* 1 and 23 comes from the same redactor (R₁). Second, Davenport's argument that *Jub.* 1:27–28 derives from a different redactor than *Jub.* 1:4b–26 rests heavily on what he thought were conflicting commands between the two passages: *Jub.* 1:4b–26 portrays Moses as being commanded to write while the Ethiopic texts of *Jub.* 1:27–28 indicates that the angel will write, thus suggesting an unreconciled inconsistency between two contributors.²⁸ VanderKam's analysis of 4Q216, however, has shown that the Ethiopic text is the result of misidentifying the Hebrew verb as a *Qal* conjugation rather a *Hiphil*,²⁹ so that there is no contradiction with the angel commanded to “dictate” and Moses commanded to “write.”³⁰ Thus, Davenport's most convincing piece of evidence distinguishing vv. 27–28 is nullified.³¹ Finally, in order to maintain his hypothesis, Davenport identifies elements by the original author and both redactors in the single verse of *Jub.* 1:29.³² One begins to wonder how confident we can be in our ability to distinguish interests of redactors—separated only by decades—phrase by phrase without further evidence. In any case, it is likely that the redactor and subsequent readers understood *Jubilees* synthetically. Thus, I proceed with an attempt to synthesize the eschatological visions of *Jub.* 1 and 23.

²⁸ Davenport, *Eschatology*, 15.

²⁹ 4Q216, Col. IV, L. 6 reads להכתוב. See *DJD* 13: 11–12, especially the textual note on L. 6.

³⁰ James C. VanderKam, “The Putative Author of the Book of Jubilees,” *Journal of Semitic Studies* 26, no. 2 (1981): 209–217, *DJD* XIII: 12 in the textual note on Col. IV L. 6 corresponding to *Jub.* 1:26–27.

³¹ Davenport also argues that the redactor has changed the scope of the book: instead of concluding with the building of the sanctuary as in 27–28, the book will describe events extending throughout the weeks of jubilees forever, *Eschatology*, 15. This argument may have been stronger if his first piece of evidence stood, but as it is, it appears much more probable that a single author was simply further defining the endpoint (the *eschatological* sanctuary) rather than a later redactor altering the scope.

³² In Davenport's view, all three strata of *Jubilees* can be identified in 1:29. The original Angelic Discourse contributed, “Then the Angel of the Presence, who went before the camp of Israel, took the tablets of the divisions of the years from the time of the creation,...of the weeks, of the jubilees according to their individual years...” (12–13); the first redactor contributed, “The tables of Torah and of the testimony” (14 n. 3); and the second, sanctuary-oriented redactor contributed “until the sanctuary of the Lord is established” (16 n. 2).

Both chapters portray a clear covenantal pattern of sin, punishment, and restoration. More specifically, both *Jub. 1* and *Jub. 23* envisage Israel's repentance as the center point of the sweep of history. *Jubilees 1* describes the restoration as Israel's turning with all the people's minds, souls, and strength to God, who will subsequently effect changes within Israel to ensure their covenant fidelity. The same point in time is pictured in *Jub. 23* as a reengaging of the Torah, both passages evoking a return to covenantal faithfulness. By linking *Jub. 1* and 23 with this fixed point of covenant restoration, one can synthesize a more complete picture. *Jubilees 1* provides the end points for the time span of the "law and the testimony." It begins at creation with Eden as the holy of holies, and it extends to new creation with God's reign from Zion and the restoration of the temple. *Jubilees 23*, in turn, contributes more information on the intervening period between the termini. The cosmos does not simply exist in three states: pure, fallen, and restored purity. Rather, the earth and all its inhabitants gradually decline—a process typified by human life spans—from creation to that "evil generation" wherein the low point is *Jub. 23:25*. The decline of creation is a result of the sins of humanity, who forget the "commandment, covenant, festival, month, sabbath, jubilee, and every verdict." These privileges, especially the sabbath and festivals, are only given to the covenant people in *Jubilees*, so that this forgetfulness responsible for the decline of creation can only be characterized as covenant unfaithfulness. Thus, the eschatological vision from these two chapters portrays Israel's return to God by way of Torah-study as triggering the gradual restoration of humanity and creation that will culminate in the final state of new creation when God's presence resides on Mt. Zion.

4.3 OTHER PASSAGES RELATED TO RESTORATION AND ESCHATOLOGY

With *Jub.* 1 and 23 establishing the broader vision of the restoration and eschatology, I turn to other passages that are not primarily focused on eschatology but provide brief statements with eschatological significance. This enriches my description of *Jubilees*' eschatology, first, by demonstrating that my claims are not isolated to two chapters but are supported throughout the work and, second, by supplementing additional information to fill out the synthesis of *Jub.* 1 and 23. I show that the restoration of the covenant people represents the solution to the problems of all of creation after I establish the corollary motif that humanity's sin deleteriously affects the animal kingdom and the created order.

4.3.1 THE RAMIFICATIONS OF COVENANT UNFAITHFULNESS FOR CREATION

Van Ruiten observes that the rewriting of the creation of humanity in *Jub.* 2:14 is considerably shorter than Gen 1:26–31.³³ What may appear to be important elements of the creation of humanity (e.g., the creation of man in the image of God, the blessing of God, the command to be fruitful and multiply, and the designation of food) have dropped out of the narrative for the author of *Jubilees*.³⁴ These omissions make it all the more striking that *Jub.* 2:14 includes the purpose for humanity to rule over everything on earth *twice*. Some elements of Gen 1:26–28 may have been omitted because they were disagreeable to the author;³⁵

³³ van Ruiten, *Primaeval*, 44–46.

³⁴ On the diversity of early Jewish uses of Gen 1:26–28 according to each author's *Tendenz*, see John R. Levison, *Portraits of Adam in Early Judaism: From Sirach to 2 Baruch*, JSPSup 1 (Sheffield: JSOT, 1987), 146–148.

³⁵ E.g., the use of the divine name or the plural form “let us make”; van Ruiten, *Primaeval*, 44–45.

however, other elements are cited later in the book, just not in the creation story.³⁶ These data indicate that the author has rewritten the creation of humanity in a highly selective fashion. Thus, it appears humanity's dominion over all of creation holds special prominence, since the author refers to it twice.

In a similar fashion as Genesis, *Jub.* 3 describes God's curse of the serpent and humanity. After the cursing, God makes clothing for Adam and Eve in *Jub.* 3:26–30 (cf. Gen 3:21). There are significant differences with Genesis in *Jubilees'* description, however. The clothing of Adam forms thematic brackets around the paragraph (*Jub.* 3:26, 30–31), which clearly characterizes Adam in a priestly role. This is seen in Adam's act of burning the incense of the tabernacle as he leaves the Garden, which is equated with the Holy of Holies for *Jubilees* (*Jub.* 8:19). Moreover, because the prohibition of nakedness is directly linked to the burning of incense, the clothing Adam receives is conceived of as priestly garments.³⁷ Interestingly, the reference to the ramifications of Adam's sin on the animals is linked with this priestly motif:

On that day, the mouths of all the animals, the cattle, the birds, everything that walks and everything that moves were made incapable of speaking because all of them used to converse with one another in one language and one tongue. He dismissed from the Garden of Eden all the animate beings that were in the Garden of Eden. All animate beings were dispersed—each by its kind and each by its nature—into the places(s) which had been created for them. But of all the animals and cattle he permitted Adam alone to cover his shame. (*Jubilees* 3:28–30)

Three points from this passage are noteworthy. First, the animals of the garden experience their own kind of exile from God's presence. God “dismissed” and “dispersed” the animals

³⁶ E.g., the creation of humanity in God's image in *Jub.* 6:8.

³⁷ Van Ruiten, *Primaeval*, 106–107. Van Ruiten reads the incense against the background of Exod 30:7–8, 34–38; Num 16:39–40; 2 Chron 26:16–20 (88 n. 53) and the clothing against the background of Exod 20:26; 28:40–43.

from the garden as a result of Adam and Eve's sin.³⁸ Second, the animals lose their capability of speech, which is portrayed as a prominent divine blessing (cf. *Jub.* 12:25–27), because of humanity's sin in the Garden.³⁹ Here, the transgression of Adam and Eve primarily had ramifications on the animal world rather than humanity.⁴⁰ Third, only humanity receives the special privilege of clothing in the new realities outside of Eden. The author uses this privilege of clothing to mark out the covenant people “who know the judgment of the law” from the Gentiles who, like the animals, uncover themselves (*Jub.* 3:31). Thus, the first recorded priestly activity done by humanity follows the moment when both humanity and animals are exiled from the Holy of Holies, the Garden of Eden. *Jubilees* rewrites the Adam narrative in the categories of purity and priesthood, specifically Israelite categories that distinguish the nation from the Gentiles.

A further piece of evidence pertaining to the relationship between the decline of humanity and the decline of the animal kingdom comes in Esau's enraged speech to Jacob before their two families go to war with each other. In reference to his broken oath to love his brother, Esau declares that “[n]either mankind nor animals⁴¹ have a true oath which they, once they have sworn, have sworn (it as valid) forever” (*Jub.* 37:18). As the speech continues, Esau conditions his animosity towards Jacob on the sustained order of creation as

³⁸ Loren Stuckenbruck reads the current text of *Jubilees* as inconsistent on whether the animals were ever allowed in the garden because *Jub.* 3:16 indicates Adam was guarding it against “birds, animals, and cattle”; “The Book of Jubilees and the Origin of Evil,” in *Enoch and the Mosaic Torah: The Evidence of Jubilees* (ed. Gabriele Boccaccini and Giovanni Ibba; Grand Rapids, Mich.: Eerdmans, 2009), 296–297, n. 13; however, it may also be that the “protection” Adam provided the garden was something less than expulsion, especially in light of their clear expulsion after the sin.

³⁹ Van Ruiten suggests that the animals' capability of speech was derived by the author from the serpents ability to tempt Eve, cf. Gen. 3:1–5; *Jub.* 3:17–19, *Primaeval*, 107.

⁴⁰ Stuckenbruck, “Origin of Evil,” 297. I note, however, that most of the biblical results of Adam's sin are taken up including pain in childbirth (*Jub.* 3:24), curse of the ground (*Jub.* 3:25) and death (*Jub.* 4:3); Hahne, *Corruption and Redemption*, 70.

⁴¹ The Hebrew of 4Q223–224 Unit 2, Col. IV, L. reads “[sn]akes” rather than “animals”; *DJD* 13:121.

they presently experience it, such that if the created order changed, then Esau's rage would turn to love for Jacob:

If wolves make peace with lambs so that they do not eat them or injure them; and if they have resolved to treat them well, then there will be peace in my mind for you. If the lion becomes the friend of a bull, and if it is harnessed together with it in a yoke and plows with it and makes peace with it, then I will make peace with you. If the raven turns white like the raza-bird,⁴² then know that I love you and will make peace with you. (*Jub.* 37:21–23)

Two points are worth bringing out from this passage. First, Esau, the story's antagonist, understands the influence between creation and humanity to move in the opposite direction as the author's eschatological vision. Esau will only change his behavior if creation reverses, whereas the author depicts the covenant people as influencing the created order. Second, at least two of the examples from nature utilized by Esau are closely associated with the covenant restoration in Isa 11:6a; 65:25, which depict the wolf making peace with the lamb and the lion eating with the bull. The author appears to be saying ironically that these reversals of nature that seem so far-fetched to Esau are actually assured by the prophetic word. The fact that the author conceives of Isa 65:25 as sure prophecy is confirmed by his earlier use of the text in the picture of Deuteronomic restoration in *Jub.* 23:27–31.⁴³ Thus, Esau predicates his behavior on reversals of nature that are drawn from images in a prophetic passage previously used by the author to describe the covenant restoration. The point for the author seems to be that Esau is utterly mistaken in his view of the relationship between humanity and creation. Humanity's faithfulness to the covenant will bring about harmony even amongst what appear now to be natural foes.

In preparation for demonstrating how the restoration of creation follows Israel's restoration to the covenant, I have argued that *Jubilees* connects the decline of the created

⁴² 4Q223–224 Unit 2, Col. IV, L. 11 reads “pelic[an]” rather than “raza-bird”; *DJD* 13:121.

⁴³ Endres, *Biblical Interpretation*, 59–61.

order to human sin. There is, however, an important discussion to be had at this point concerning the effects of fallen angels on humanity and creation at large. Angels of the Lord corrupted themselves through marriage with human women, unions that produced violent giants as offspring (*Jub.* 5:1; 7:21–25). Immediately after the report of the angels’ sin, the author describes the decline of the earth:

Wickedness increased on the earth. All animate beings corrupted their way—(everyone of them) from people to cattle, animals, birds, and everything that moves about on the ground. All of them corrupted their way and their prescribed course.... Every thought of all mankind’s knowledge was evil like this all the time. (*Jub.* 5:2; cf. 7:24)

Though the text does not provide an explicit logical connection between *Jub.* 5:1 and 5:2, the relative increase of wickedness on the earth is clearly connected *in some sense* to the sin of the fallen angels. This human corruption is then identified as the cause for the cosmic disaster of the flood (*Jub.* 5:3–5; 7:20–25). The presentation of the sin of the Watchers in close connection to the corruption of humanity and the rest of creation raises the question of how to relate this motif to that of humanity’s responsibility for the corruption of creation. That is, to whom does *Jubilees* primarily assign blame for the corruption of creation: to humanity or to the Watchers or to both?

While the corruption that led up to the flood was modeled on and exacerbated by the Watchers’ sin, *Jubilees* also places the culpability of the corruption of creation on sinful humanity. The evidence in *Jubilees* itself is ambiguous. *Jubilees* 5:1–2 implicitly connects the Watchers’ sin with the corruption of humanity. Nevertheless, the wording of 5:2 indicates that mankind corrupted themselves.⁴⁴ In a later passage, *Jub.* 7:22–24 suggests that the half-human progeny of the Watchers, along with the rest of full-blooded humanity, *together* set

⁴⁴ John S. Bergsma, “The Relationship between Jubilees and the Early Enochic Books (Astronomical Book and Book of the Watchers),” in *Enoch and the Mosaic Torah: The Evidence of Jubilees* (Grand Rapids, Mich.: Eerdmans, 2009), 48.

the precedent of bloodshed for the rest of creation that ultimately led to the Flood. Thus, *Jubilees* places the blame for creation's corruption on both the Watchers and humanity.

One can bring the ambiguity into sharper focus by comparing *Jubilees*' retelling of the story of the Watchers with two earlier narrations in Gen 6 and the *Book of Watchers* (*BW*). In Loren Stuckenbruck's analysis of the three narrations of the flood story, he suggests that *Jubilees*, as the latest of the writings, stands conceptually between the accounts in Genesis and the *BW*.⁴⁵ Whereas Genesis clearly locates blame on humanity (Gen 6:5–6, 13) and *BW* views the Watchers' sin as the primary cause (1 *En.* 10:1–3), *Jub.* 5:2–5 and 7:20–25 offer a more nuanced, mediating line: “the great flood comes as the divine retribution against antediluvian sins of human beings whose wrongdoings were fueled by the transgressing angels and giants.”⁴⁶ Thus, when compared to Genesis and *BW*, *Jubilees* places emphasis on human culpability for the flood while still acknowledging the exacerbating effects of the Watchers. This mediating position accords well with the broader theme of human sin corrupting the created order found throughout *Jubilees*.⁴⁷

4.3.2 THE RAMIFICATIONS OF COVENANT FAITHFULNESS FOR CREATION

I have shown in the previous section that *Jubilees* correlates covenant unfaithfulness with the decline of creation. This connection, present throughout *Jubilees*, comes into sharpest relief in *Jub.* 23:14, 16–18.⁴⁸ The link between covenant unfaithfulness and the decline of creation serves as the negative backdrop against which the author depicts the covenant restoration

⁴⁵ Stuckenbruck, “Origin of Evil,” 300.

⁴⁶ Stuckenbruck, “Origin of Evil,” 300.

⁴⁷ We also note that the covenant people *should be* immune to the effects of demonic activity based on Noah's writings (*Jub.* 10:12–14).

⁴⁸ This is especially clear in *Jub.* 23:18: “the earth will be destroyed because of all that they do.”

bringing about the renewing of creation. I turn now to explore evidence outside *Jub.* 1 and 23 that connects covenant faithfulness to the gradual restoration of creation.

The first pertinent passage is *Jub.* 4:26, which describes the connection between Mt. Zion's eschatological sanctification and the sanctification of the earth. The context of *Jub.* 4:20–26 is a description of Enoch's time in the Garden of Eden. There are two related points to draw out. First, in *Jubilees* the Flood's waters do not affect the Garden of Eden because of Enoch's presence and his activities of testifying against humanity and burning the evening incense of the sanctuary (*Jub.* 4:24–25). Second, the author immediately connects this to a list of the holiest places on earth. The last of these is Mt. Zion, which, according to *Jub.* 4:26, “will be sanctified in the new creation for the sanctification of the earth. For this reason, the earth will be sanctified from all sins and from its uncleanness into the history of eternity.” The correspondence for the author seems to be that, just as Enoch's priestly activity within the sanctuary caused Eden to be spared during the Flood, so Israel's priestly activity in the eschatological temple will bring about the purification and renewing of creation.⁴⁹ In brief, the maintenance of the divine presence through priestly activity both preserves and restores the cosmos.

The next relevant passage is *Jubilees*' rewriting of Noah's sacrifice after the flood. The version of the story in Genesis does not specify the exact nature of Noah's sacrifice, only that he offered burnt offerings on the altar (Gen 8:20–22). *Jubilees*, however, clarifies the offering with the addition of *Jub.* 6:2: “He appeared on the earth, took a kid, and atoned with its blood for all the sins of the earth because everything that was on it had been obliterated except those who were in the ark with Noah.” This atoning for “all the sins of the earth”

⁴⁹ There is also a clear distinction between their activities, as Enoch is primarily present in Eden to preserve a testimony against the sins of the Watchers and humanity, while the purity of the eschatological sanctuary on Mt. Zion brings about the purification necessary because of the sins and uncleanness of the entire earth.

needs to be understood against *Jubilees*' recurring connection between human sin and the defiling of the earth (especially *Jub.* 23:14; also 4:2–3; 5:3; 7:33; 16:5–6), with the biblical base material for the concept coming from Lev 18:26–28 and Num 35:33–34. With regard to *Jub.* 6:2, van Ruiten particularly highlights the connection to Num 35:33–34,⁵⁰ where blood spilled through murder defiles the land and expiation must be made for it. It is significant to observe the grounding for the command in Num 35:34: “You shall not defile the land in which you live, in which I also dwell; for⁵¹ I the LORD dwell among the Israelites.” As the warning against defiling the land is closely connected to God’s presence in Numbers, so in *Jub.* 6:1–4 Noah serves as priest on behalf of the earth after the purification by the deluge. This priestly activity implies a nearness to God’s presence. Moreover, as was previously discussed (§2.2.2.2), Noah’s actions in the third month are clearly rewritten in order to evoke images of the Sinai covenant. Thus, here the covenant representative, Noah, acts as an Israelite priest by atoning for the entire creation.⁵²

Jubilees 19:18–29 links Jacob and his descendants to the renewing of all creation. In my previous discussion of Abraham’s blessing of Jacob, I concluded that the sonship language of 19:29 corresponded to the election language of 19:18a based on van Ruiten’s analysis of the structure of the passage. Moreover, the blessings passed on by Abraham were

⁵⁰ *Primaeval*, 225–226. Van Ruiten provides careful consideration between Lev 18:26–28 and Num 35:33–34 before opting for the latter. While Lev. 18:26–28 pertains to the sexual sins—a prominent theme in *Jubilees*—which defiled the land and caused its inhabitants to be vomited out, there are no verbatim parallels to *Jub.* 6:2 of more than a word, nor is there mention of the sin of the land or its subsequent atonement. Numbers 35:33–34 pertains to the pollution of blood split by murder, one of the reasons for the flood in *Jub.* 7:21–25. Van Ruiten notes, Numbers requires the blood of the murderers, who would have been killed in the flood. Thus, Noah must present the blood of the sacrifice as a substitute.

⁵¹ יָד in the MT, γὰρ in the OG/LXX.

⁵² There may also be allusions to the Day of Atonement. See James C. VanderKam, “The Angel Story in the Book of Jubilees,” in *Pseudepigraphic Perspectives*, ed. Esther G. Chazon, Michael Stone, and Avital Pinnick, STDJ 31 (Leiden: Brill, 1999), 163–169. VanderKam points to similar wording found in Lev 16:34 in *Jub.* 5:17–18 in combination with the verb “atoned” in *Jub.* 6:2.

none other than the blessings entailed in Abraham's covenant with God. The new point to be drawn out here is that God's firstborn, the covenant elect, will benefit all creation. *Jubilees* 19:25 reads: "May they serve (the purpose of) laying heaven's foundations, making the earth firm, and renewing all the luminaries which are above the firmament." Again, this renewing of creation is closely linked with the priestly line of Adam, Enoch, Noah, and Shem (*Jub.* 19:27). So, *Jubilees* presents Jacob and his descendants as God's firstborn son, the covenant elect people, who serve as priests on behalf of creation resulting in the renewing of creation.

Finally, *Jub.* 50:5 supports the picture of a gradual renewal found in *Jub.* 23. This final chapter of the book focuses again on the sabbath commandments.⁵³ The Angel of the Presence informs Moses that he was given the sabbath days, the sabbaths of the land, and the jubilees so that they will be observed while Israel is in the land (*Jub.* 50:1–4). Of course, Moses has already been informed that this entrance into the land will not last (cf. *Jub.* 1:7–14). Nevertheless, *Jub.* 50:5 selectively characterizes Israel's future:

The jubilees will pass by until Israel is pure of every sexual evil, impurity, contamination, sin and error. Then they will live confidently in the entire land. They will no longer have any satan or any evil person. The land will be pure from that time until eternity. (*Jub.* 50:5)

Here the two dimensions of sacred time and sacred space overlap: the purity of the people—with the context emphasizing calendar observance—leads to the purity of the land. In addition to my earlier discussion connecting the sabbath to the heavenly cult, two statements in this passage tie the sabbath law to Israel's priestly role. First, the one work allowed on the sabbath is to "burn incense and to bring before the Lord offerings and sacrifices for the days and the sabbaths" (*Jub.* 50:10). Second, unlike the biblical material, *Jubilees* prohibits sexual

⁵³ VanderKam argues that *Jub.* 50:6–13 provides a fitting ending to the book as a whole, noting that the sabbath halakhot form an inclusio with *Jub.* 2:15–33 and that 50:13 harks back to the title of the book in the prologue and *Jub.* 1; James C. VanderKam, "The End of the Matter? Jubilees 50:6-13 and the Unity of the Book," in *Heavenly Tablets: Interpretation, Identity and Tradition in Ancient Judaism*, ed. Lynn R. LiDonnici and Andrea Lieber, JSJSup 119 (Leiden: Brill, 2007), 267–284.

intercourse during the sabbath (*Jub.* 50:8) in what appears to be a desire to maintain ritual purity.⁵⁴ The author likely views sex as defiling (Lev 15:16–18) and, hence, prohibiting one from drawing near to the presence of God (Exod 19:10, 15). So, for the author, proper observance of sacred time requires ritual purity in much the same way as proper maintenance of sacred space. As Israel maintains the purity of the sabbath and its priestly role, Israel will gradually become pure as the jubilees pass, and this purification of the covenant elect will bring about the purification of the land.

4.4 CONCLUSION: GOD’S SONS, GOD’S PRESENCE, AND THE NEW CREATION

Eschatological visions begin with present circumstances but transcend that plane in order to articulate an author’s hope for the future and the events that will precipitate the needed changes. The author does not scour only prophetic texts for future oriented events. Rather, he offers an intricate interpretation of the primeval and patriarchal periods in order to imagine the second half of the arc of world history. The culmination is variously pictured as new creation, God’s reign from Zion, and the renewed temple. Accordingly, my discussion of eschatology in *Jubilees* has included events that are ancient history from the perspective of the author. Adam and Enoch are presented as prototypical Israelite priests burning incense in the Garden of Eden, the Holy of Holies. Enoch’s priestly activity during the flood preserved the Garden in an analogous way as the eschatological temple on Zion will bring about the renewing of creation. For *Jubilees*, the protological picture of God’s dwelling in Eden within creation at the beginning of history will be mirrored by God’s dwelling in the eschatological temple within the new creation at the culmination of history.

⁵⁴ Doering, “The Concept of the Sabbath in the Book of Jubilees,” 196.

Jubilees depicts Israel's faithfulness or unfaithfulness to the covenant as the decisive factor in the course of world history. The whole of creation follows the trajectory of God's firstborn, the descendants of Jacob. *Jubilees* 1 presents Israel's covenant renewal as the center of history with creation and new creation as the beginning and end points. The author frames Deut 31 with Gen 1 and Isa 65. That is, while the covenantal pattern of Deut 31 is primarily about Israel's return to the blessings of Canaan, the covenantal pattern of *Jub.* 1, in contrast, is about Israel returning to her privileged place within the cosmos and thus bringing about its renewal. *Jubilees* 23 centers the gradual decline of creation and the hoped for gradual restoration around Israel's restoration. Thus, for *Jubilees* the community designated as "God's sons" is linked to the eschatological new creation through a deeply covenantal logic. Israel's elect status to covenant with the God of creation uniquely enables them to wield influence over the created order.

One should note that Israel's effect on creation is often linked to her priestly line. The author's selective rewriting of the Adamic narrative highlights both humanity's dominion over the rest of creation (*Jub.* 2:14) and Adam's priestly role (*Jub.* 3:26–30). Enoch's priestly activity preserves Eden from the Flood in a similar fashion that the eschatological temple on Zion sanctifies the earth (*Jub.* 4:26). Noah makes atonement for the entire earth in his priestly role after the Flood (*Jub.* 6:2). God's firstborn, and particularly the priests in the line of Adam, Enoch, Noah, and Shem, serve the purpose of renewing creation in *Jub.* 19:18–29. In this regard, Israel both *is* a priestly nation as a whole (*Jub.* 16:18; 33:20) and also *possesses* a priestly line who execute the cultic service (*Jub.* 30:18; 32:1, 3, 9).⁵⁵ This priestly vocation naturally links with *Jubilees*' eschatological expectation that is consistently characterized

⁵⁵ The author's distinction between Israel as a priestly nation and the priestly line of Levi is also demonstrated in that there are two classes of angelic correspondents: the angels of holiness and the angels of the presence.

with the divine presence. Just as Eden is the holy of holies in the first creation, so also the purified temple on Zion will be the dwelling place of the Lord in the new creation (*Jub.* 1:26–29). From these data, I infer that *Jubilees* conceives of Israel’s influence over the created order as priestly in nature. In other words, when Israel is faithful to its priestly vocation, the Lord dwells with his people and brings about the renewing of creation.

4.4.1 SUMMARY OF DIVINE SONSHIP IN *JUBILEES*

It is convenient to summarize the findings on *Jubilees*’ use of the “sons of God” before turning to a comparison with the theme in Romans.

Jubilees uses divine sonship language to designate those chosen for covenant relationship with God. More specifically, the author deploys the language to support his theology of the single, eternal covenant. Thus, we see Israel’s filial relationship to God affirmed at the beginning of history during the week of creation, and at the culmination of history within the new creation. When God extended the blessing of the sabbath to Israel during the week of creation, he designated Jacob and his descendants as the firstborn son of God (*Jub.* 2:19–20). When God dwells visibly as the king on Mt. Zion, all will know that he is the father of all Jacob’s children (*Jub.* 1:28). By anchoring Israel’s divine sonship in creation and new creation, the author assures the people of Israel’s status as God’s sons from the beginning of history to the end. Moreover, primeval figures and the patriarchs participating in the same covenant that Israel enters into on Mt. Sinai assures that Jacob and his descendants are accurately designated God’s firstborn son. Indeed, they are renewing participation in the single, eternal covenant in which Adam, Enoch, Noah, Shem, and Abraham participated (*Jub.* 19:26–29).

Jubilees also designates Israel as the sons of God in the middle of history, which for the author is the restoration of the covenant (*Jub.* 1:22–25). At some point in their exile, Israel will return to God with their whole being, and God, in turn, will give the people circumcised minds, purity, and a new holy spirit, all of which will allow Israel to fulfill the law. God then declares that he will be Israel’s father and they will be sons of the living God. The reality of this filial relationship to God will be authenticated to every angel and spirit. Thus, *Jubilees* brings together the elements of internal circumcision, the giving of a holy spirit, law fulfillment, and divine sonship to describe the restored relationship with God.

By reading *Jub.* 1 and 23 synthetically, I argued that *Jubilees* invests the covenant restoration not just with national ramifications but also with cosmic significance because it stands as the focal point between creation and new creation. The unfaithfulness of covenant members led to the deterioration of the created order until the low point of the “evil generation.” But the restoration of the sons of God as covenant members leads, jubilee by jubilee, to the restoration of creation. *Jubilees* 19:25 explicitly connects Jacob and his descendants to the renewal of the cosmos: “May they serve (the purpose of) laying heaven’s foundations, making the earth firm, and renewing all the luminaries which are above the firmament.” Thus, for *Jubilees* the sons of God are tied to the state of the remainder of creation.

This connection is no mere coincidence. Rather, a natural link exists between Israel’s divine sonship and the renewing of creation because Israel’s election is woven directly into the very fabric of creation, both in the spatial and temporal dimensions. God’s gift of the sabbath to Israel, his firstborn son, allows the nation to synchronize their observance of the day with the heavenly sabbath observed by the highest ranking angels and even God himself (*Jub.* 2:19–22). Similarly, divine disclosure about the Festival of Weeks (*Jub.* 6:18–20) and

circumcision (*Jub.* 15:25–27) aligns Israel’s worship with the heavenly cult. Moreover, heavenly revelation in the elect’s written tradition provides information about the holiest locations on earth (*Jub.* 8:11–12; 32:16). All of these holy sites, where the divine presence dwelt in the past, are contained within Israel’s land inheritance. Thus the “law and testimony,” that is, *The Book of Jubilees* itself, enables the sons of God to live in accordance with the realities of the cosmos and to align Israel’s worship of the Creator with the heavenly liturgy. When one understands the nature of Israel’s election according to the author of *Jubilees*, the ramifications of Israel’s covenant faithfulness (or unfaithfulness, for that matter) for the rest of creation begin to fall into place. The sons of God as covenant members serve as the conduit of divine blessing or divine cursing to the remainder of creation.

Jubilees links the influence of the sons of God over creation to their possession of a priesthood in the line of Levi as well as the priestly nature of the nation as a whole. In other words, the sons of God serve as a *priestly* conduit of blessing. Adam’s activity as the first earthly priest occurs immediately after his sin brought about negative consequences for the animals of the garden (*Jub.* 3:26–30). Enoch’s priestly activity spared the Garden of Eden from the Flood just as the eschatological Temple will sanctify the earth (*Jub.* 4:24–25). Noah’s sacrifice makes atonement for the earth after the Flood (*Jub.* 6:2). Finally, in *Jub.* 19:25 the covenant people’s purpose to renew the cosmos is linked with the priestly line of Adam, Enoch, Noah, and Shem (*Jub.* 19:27). When Israel acts as the cosmic priesthood in the proper place on earth and in the proper time of the year as prescribed by the heavenly tablets, then Jacob’s descendants align themselves with the priesthood of Adam, Enoch, Noah, and, most importantly, the angels of the presence. Because *Jubilees* frequently links the covenant people’s influence over creation with their priestly activity, I infer that the effective priestly

ministry of the sons of God prepares the way for the indwelling of the presence of God and the renewing of creation that results from that indwelling.

This inference that the influence of God's sons over creation is a priestly one is corroborated by *Jubilees*' eschatological expectation of the divine presence. Just as the Garden of Eden served as the Holy of holies and the residence of the Lord before creation was corrupted (*Jub.* 8:19), so in the new creation the eschatological temple will be where the Lord reigns as king in full view of all (*Jub.* 1:26–29). The implication is that the loss of divine presence marked the beginning of creation's decline, and the full restoration of the divine presence marks the culmination of the recovery. Moreover, when God's presence is visible to all, that presence will clearly delineate who the sons of God are. In the meantime, the sons of God are connected to the divine presence through their unique access to the sacred time and space provided through the "law and the testimony."

DIVINE SONSHIP IN ROMANS 9

I have shown in chapters two through four above that *Jubilees* links a series of motifs to divine sonship (Abrahamic descent, the giving of a new spirit, and renewed creation). Further, I have explored how this collocation works within its broader theology. *Jubilees* deploys divine sonship language in order to support the theology of a single, eternal covenant. In accordance with this eternal covenant, *Jubilees* must show that Jacob, Abraham's true descendent, is God's firstborn son in the same lineage of Adam, Noah, and Shem. Israel, however, would forget the covenant stipulations, particularly the sacred times and correct calendar, and God would punish the people with exile. For *Jubilees*, God would once again restore Israel's father-son relationship—that is, the covenant relationship—by giving the people a circumcised mind and a new holy spirit so that it might fulfill the law. Israel's restoration of covenant relationship would reverse the gradual deterioration of creation and lead to the new creation. This decline and restoration of creation is linked to the decline and restoration of human life spans.

In the remaining chapters of this study, I examine Paul's use of divine sonship language in Romans.¹ My primary task is to show that both *Jubilees* and Romans conceive of "God's sons" as covenant members. I argue that Paul collocates Abrahamic descent, new creation, and the Spirit with "God's sons" because he conceives of the category in an analogous manner as the author of *Jubilees*.

¹ Romans uses filial terms concerning Jesus (1:3–4; 5:10; 8:3, 29), those in Christ (8:14, 15, 16, 17, 19, 21, 23, 29), and in his consideration of Israel (9:4, 8, 26).

In the present chapter, I argue that Paul’s use of the term “adoption as son” (υιοθεσία) in Rom 9:4 designates the ratification the Sinai covenant associated with the giving of the law. I then demonstrate that in Rom 9:7–8 Paul assumes that the category “children of God” (τέκνα τοῦ θεοῦ) is equivalent to “descendants of Abraham” (σπέρμα Ἀβραάμ). Paul, that is, shares an assumption with *Jubilees* that the “sons of God” are the “descendants of Abraham.” This finding supports the contention that the category of divine sonship connotes covenant membership in Romans. The last divine sonship text in the chapter is Rom 9:25–26, concerning which I argue that Paul’s mixed quotation from Hosea depicts the restoration of the covenant as including Jews and Gentiles as “sons of the living God.” The conclusion is that Paul’s use of “adoption as sons” and “children of God” in Rom 9 evoke similar connotations as divine sonship in *Jubilees*. Yet, when one recognizes this shared conception of “God’s sons” as covenant members in Rom 9, a sharp ideological divide between Paul and *Jubilees* emerges with particular clarity.

In particular, as argued below, Paul decouples the Abrahamic covenant from the Sinai covenant. The division begins to be visible in Rom 9:4 where, as in *Jubilees*, Israel’s divine sonship is linked to the giving of the law. Here, the list of Israel’s privileges, per Rom 9:4–5, describe the Sinai covenant privileges. Unlike *Jubilees*, however, Paul treats the Sinai covenant as separate from the Abrahamic covenant. This separation, I argue, can be seen in the distinction created by the “adoption-law giving” language of Rom 9:4 in contrast with the “children of promise” language in Rom 9:8. This sets up the further argument, which I pursue in ch. 6, that the “Spirit of adoption” in Rom 8:15 is distinct from, yet related to, the “adoption” in Rom 9:4. The two “adoptions” are related because they both connote the ratification of a people as covenant members with God. Yet, for Paul, they are distinct because the “adoption” characterized by the Spirit marks out God’s eschatological people,

while some who possess the “adoption” characterized by the law have missed the goal of their course (Rom 9:5, 30–33). Where *Jubilees* maintains that there was a single, eternal covenant, thus equating the Abrahamic and Sinai covenants, Paul maintains a distinction so that some who currently participate in the Sinai covenant can simultaneously be excluded from the Abrahamic covenant fulfilled in Christ.

In what follows, I set up the broader literary context of Rom 9–11 before examining in detail the three divine sonship texts in Rom 9. Then, after examining each text in turn, I bring the findings from Rom 9 into conversation with the concept of “sons of God” in *Jubilees*, articulating similarities and differences that bear upon Paul’s theology of divine sonship.

5.1 DIVINE SONSHIP WITHIN THE CONTEXT OF ROMANS 9

Romans 9–11 is Paul’s attempt to grapple with the current state of ethnic Jews with respect to the gospel of Jesus Christ. His kinsmen according to the flesh received the many privileges of being Israelites, the race from whom the messiah would come (Rom 9:4–5). But Paul would voluntarily become accursed, cut off from Christ, in order to save these same recipients of privilege from their current circumstance (Rom 9:1–3; 10:1). This current state of affairs not only creates a human problem for the Apostle, but also a theological one: did the word of God fail (Rom 9:6a)?² As is widely recognized, Rom 9–11 represents Paul’s direct

² Because Paul is not explicit in Rom 9:1–5, some have denied that Rom 9 concerns Israel’s unbelief, e.g. Lloyd Gaston, *Paul and the Torah* (Vancouver: University of British Columbia Press, 1987), 92. This position, however, ignores what Paul makes explicit in Rom 10:1; 11:23. Though he responds most directly to Stendahl, see the full refutation of the bi-covenantal view (i.e., the view that Gentiles are saved by faith in Christ while Jews are saved by traditional covenant faithfulness) in Reidar Hvalvik, “A ‘Sonderweg’ for Israel: A Critical Examination of a Current Interpretation of Romans 11:25–27,” *JSNT* 38 (1990): 87–107. In any case, the vast majority of commentators recognize Israel’s unbelief as the presenting problem of the deeper theological issue concerning God’s character. W. D. Davies, “Paul and the People of Israel,” *NTS* 24.1 (1977): 13–14; Douglas A. Campbell, *The Deliverance of God: An Apocalyptic Rereading of Justification in Paul* (Cambridge: Eerdmans, 2009), 772; Neil Elliott, *The Rhetoric of Romans*, JSNTSup 45 (Sheffield Academic, 1990), 273; Richard B. Hays, *Echoes of Scripture in the Letters of Paul* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1989), 63–64; Johannes

engagement with questions raised as early as Rom 3:1–8. Romans 9–11 as a whole is broken down further into three subsections—9:6–9:29, 9:30–10:21, and 11:1–32—with 9:1–5 introducing the problem and 11:33–36 providing a closing doxology.³ Much of the secondary discussion is not so much untangling the arguments of the three separate subsections, but attempting to understand how—indeed, *if*—the three sub-arguments form a coherent whole in Rom 9–11. For my present argument, however, I primarily focus on Rom 9:1–29 because the three divine sonship references occur there.⁴

Munck, *Christ and Israel: An Interpretation of Romans 9-11*, trans. Ingeborg Nixon (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1967), 14–22; J. Ross Wagner, *Heralds of the Good News: Isaiah and Paul “In Concert” in the Letter to the Romans* (Leiden: Brill, 2002), 45; N. T. Wright, *Paul and the Faithfulness of God*, 2 vols. (London: SPCK Publishing, 2013), 1161. E. Elizabeth Johnson downplays Jewish unbelief and emphasizes the problem of the Gentile majority within the church in order to argue that the overall driving emphasis throughout Rom 9–11 is the balance of God’s impartiality to Jew and Gentile with God’s faithfulness to Israel; “Romans 9-11: The Faithfulness and Impartiality of God,” in *Pauline Theology, Volume III: Romans*, ed. David M. Hay and E. Elizabeth Johnson (Minneapolis, Minn.: Fortress Press, 1995), 215, 222. Moo rightly criticizes Johnson for downplaying Jewish unbelief as not doing justice to Paul’s concern; “The Theology of Romans 9-11: A Response to E. Elizabeth Johnson,” in *Pauline Theology, Vol. 3: Romans*, ed. D. M. Hay and E. E. Johnson (Minneapolis, Minn.: Fortress Press, 1995), 244–245. N.T. Wright characterizes the section as Paul’s answering the challenge presented by Jewish unbelief to the *δικαιοσύνη θεοῦ*, even though the term does not occur within the section until 10:3; *The Climax of the Covenant: Christ and the Law in Pauline Theology* (Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1991), 235. Similarly, Bruce W. Longenecker, “Different Answers to Different Issues: Israel, the Gentiles and Salvation History in Romans 9-11,” *JSNT* 36 (1989): 95; John Piper, *The Justification of God: An Exegetical and Theological Study of Romans 9:1-23*, 2nd ed. (Grand Rapids, Mich: Baker Books, 1993), 18; Wagner, *Heralds*, 44–45.

³ Johnson, “Romans 9-11,” 216–217; Munck, *Christ and Israel*, 25; Wright, *The Climax of the Covenant*, 237–251. There are, of course, variations in the discussion of the structure of Rom 9–11, see, e.g., Florian Wilk’s argument for a two-fold structure (9:6–10:21 and 11:1–24) in “Rahmen Und Aufbau von Römer 9-11,” in *Between Gospel and Election: Explorations in the Interpretation of Romans 9-11*, ed. Florian Wilk and J. Ross Wagner (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2010), 227–253. In the main, however, the three-fold divisions hold. Hays suggests that Rom 9–11 follows the pattern of a lament Psalm because of the opening lament and the closing doxology; Hays, *Echoes*, 58. Moo argues, based on Paul’s previous pattern of argumentation displayed in Romans, an opening exposition followed by clarifications and expansions should be expected. Thus, Rom 9:6–29 is more central to Paul’s thought than the following clarifications, and Rom 11:11 also introduces a new subsection; Moo, “Roman 9-11,” 242–243.

⁴ Thus, the main difficulty of integrating the three subsections will not dominate our discussion. Nevertheless, to my mind, Rom 9–11 does form a tightly structured and considered argument, see James D. G. Dunn, *Romans 9-16*, WBC 38B (Dallas: Word Books, 1988), 518–519; Wagner, *Heralds*, 43–44; Wright, *Paul and the Faithfulness*, 1161–1164. The problem of integrating the three sections is such that N. Walter argues that the first and second sections represent provisional statements before the Apostle *himself* comes to a new realization in the third section with the “mystery” revealed; “Zur Interpretation von Römer 9-11,” *ZTK* 81.2 (1984): 172–95. Similarly, Francis Watson, *Paul, Judaism, and the Gentiles: Beyond the New Perspective* (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 2007), 322. Reasoner has created a grid in which to locate interpreters who view Paul’s argument in Rom 9–11 as either static, calculated, and consistent, or the chapters represent varied solutions to the Israel problem, some more sensible than others; “Romans 9-11 Moves from Margin to Center, from Rejection to Salvation: Four Grids for Recent English-Language Exegesis,” in *Between Gospel and*

In Rom 9, Paul demonstrates by his retelling of the biblical material from the patriarchs to the exodus that the seed of Abraham were never merely descendants according to the flesh (v. 8) or those who do good (v. 11). Rather, those who are genuinely Israel are children of the promise (vv. 8–9), called by God (v. 12), and recipients of the freely bestowed divine mercy (v. 16). Having thus clarified the freedom of the divine choice in Israel’s election, Paul is able to apply the mixed quotation of Hos 2:23 and Hos 1:10 to both Jews and Gentiles (vv. 9:24–26). The first sub-section of Rom 9–11 closes with an initial support to Paul’s initial thesis. How do we know the word of God did not fail (v. 6)? Because the Lord will accomplish his word (λόγον) completely and quickly (v. 28). For Paul, the Jewish scriptures contain precursors of a faithful remnant within physical Israel (Rom 9:29 quoting Isa 10:22; Rom 11:1–6 quoting 1 Kings 19:10, 18; Rom 11:7), such that a pared down Israel fits into Paul’s view of the word of the Lord coming to fruition, at least in this stage of history.

5.2 ISRAEL’S ΥΙΟΘΕΣΙΑ AS GOD’S SON IN ROMANS 9:4

From the confident state of victory in the love of God at the close of Rom 8, Paul plunges into a deep depression in the opening paragraph of Rom 9, avowing the authenticity of his heartfelt pain three times over (vv. 1–2). Romans 9:3 indirectly explains (γάρ) the reason for Paul’s anguish. Paul wishes, if it were possible,⁵ that he himself could be accursed (ἀνάθεμα⁶)

Election: Explorations in the Interpretation of Romans 9-11 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2010), 82–86. My own reading falls in the former category; thus, while the focus is on Rom 9, one cannot ignore the fully developed themes in Rom 10–11, especially the quotation of Isa 59:20–21 in Rom 11:26–27.

⁵ See Cranfield’s extended comment on imperfect of ἡὐχόμεν; *Romans IX-XVI*, 454–457.

⁶ In the LXX, ἀνάθεμα can be used positively in the sense of a votive offering (e.g. Lev 27:28) or negatively in the sense of something designated for divine destruction or curse, e.g. Num 21:3. Elsewhere in Paul, it always takes the negative meaning (1 Cor 12:3; 16:22; Gal 1:8, 9). Johannes Behm, “Ἀνάθεμα, Ἀνάθημα, Κατάθεμα,” *TDNT* 1:354–356; Cranfield, *Romans IX-XVI*, 457; *A GREEK-ENGLISH LEXICON*, s.v. “Ἀνάθεμα”; Piper, *Justification of God*, 44–45; *NIDNTTE* 1, s.v. “Ἀνάθεμα.”

and cut off from Christ (ἀπὸ τοῦ Χριστοῦ) for the sake of his kinsmen according to the flesh. The implication is that Paul was willing to enter the very state in which his kinsmen according to the flesh currently find themselves.⁷

Verses 4–5 introduce a series of relative pronouns that further identify the kinsmen according to the flesh. The great irony of the situation is that *the very ones* who find themselves as recipients of divine wrath are also the recipients of a great list of divine privileges:

They are Israelites, and to them belong the adoption, the glory, the covenants, the giving of the law, the worship, and the promises; to them belong the patriarchs, and from them, according to the flesh, comes the Messiah, who is over all, God blessed forever. Amen. (Rom 9:4–5, NRSV)

οἵτινές εἰσιν Ἰσραηλῖται, ὧν ἡ υἰοθεσία καὶ ἡ δόξα καὶ αἱ διαθήκαι καὶ ἡ νομοθεσία καὶ ἡ λατρεία καὶ αἱ ἐπαγγελίαι, ὧν οἱ πατέρες καὶ ἐξ ὧν ὁ Χριστὸς τὸ κατὰ σάρκα, ὁ ὢν ἐπὶ πάντων θεὸς, εὐλογητὸς εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας, ἀμήν. (Rom 9:4–5)

The Israelites' reception of this great list of God-given privileges, then, serves implicitly as the motivation for Paul's statement in v. 3. Precisely because his kinsmen according to the flesh are Israelites, possess the list of privileges, possess the fathers, and are the family-line of the Christ, Paul would be cut off from Christ for them. This logic, combined with the use of the present tense (οἵτινές εἰσιν), implies that this same group who is anathema is simultaneously Israelites and possessors of privilege.⁸ The final two relative pronouns designate the Israelites as the possessors of the fathers and those from whom comes the Christ. John Piper observes that these two designations bring out the temporal development of Israel's history. He comments: "the fathers, at the beginning, give rise to the people of

⁷ Piper correctly observes that Paul speaks "indirectly and thus sensitively" about the condition of Israel, *Justification of God*, 45.

⁸ Both of these observations are correctly brought out in Piper, *Justification of God*, 24.

Israel; the Christ, at the end, comes *from* the people” as their “decisive climax.”⁹ These are the first hints that, by rejecting its messiah, Israel has missed the goal of its course (cf. Rom 9:31; 10:3–4). Romans 9:1–5 thus depicts Paul’s agony over the ironic circumstance of the Israelites’ being accursed and cut off from Christ despite *currently* possessing the covenant privileges and standing in the lineage between the patriarchs and the messiah. The anguish expressed, then, indicates to the reader Paul’s struggle to reconcile that those who have received the “adoption” in Rom 9:4, the ethnic descendents of the fathers who would produce the messiah, currently stand cutoff from that messiah.¹⁰

5.2.1 LITERATURE REVIEW ON PAUL’S USE OF ΥΙΟΘΕΣΙΑ

The first in the list of Israel’s privileges is their υιοθεσία. James Scott’s exhaustive lexical study concludes the term denotes “adoption as son.”¹¹ It is one of the more commonly attested of the words used for adoption, though the vast majority of the occurrences of the υιοθετεῖν word group are found in inscriptions, particularly in Rhodes, rather than in literary evidence.¹² Two of Scott’s findings affect the study of Paul’s use of υιοθεσία. First, whereas some of the terms in the lexical field have theological uses, Paul’s metaphorical use of υιοθεσία in the context of a god’s adoption of a son is unparalleled.¹³ Second, the lexical

⁹ Piper, *Justification of God*, 43.

¹⁰ In this sense Jochen Flebbe correctly describes the problem set up by 9:1–5 and answered in vv. 6–29 as a “Gottesfrage”; Jochen Flebbe, *Solus Deus: Untersuchungen Zur Rede von Gott Im Brief Des Paulus an Die Römer*, BZNW 159 (Berlin: Walter De Gruyter, 2008), 268–269.

¹¹ Scott, *Adoption*, 55–56. Scott examined the entire semantic field including six word groups: εἰσποιεῖν, ἐκποιεῖν, τίθεσθαι, ποιεῖσθαι, υἱοποιεῖσθαι, and υἱοθετεῖν. Scott was able to demonstrate conclusively that υιοθεσία denotes “adoption as son” as opposed to the more general concept of “sonship,” which was suggested by Byrne, *Sons of God*, 80. For a listing of the evidence, see also *THE VOCABULARY OF THE GREEK TESTAMENT*, s.v. “Υιοθεσία”; *A GREEK-ENGLISH LEXICON*, s.v. “Υιοθεσία.”

¹² Scott, *Adoption*, 44–55.

¹³ Scott, *Adoption*, 55. Byrne also concludes there are no previous “metaphorical” uses of υιοθεσία as in the NT (*Sons of God*, 80).

content of the υιοθετεῖν word group cannot be demonstrably linked exclusively to any one specific legal procedure, whether from Greek or Roman law.¹⁴ As always, context determines a word's meaning.

While there is relative clarity on the translation of the term, there is considerable debate concerning the background of Paul's use of "adoption," particularly in Rom 8:15, 23 and Gal 4:5.¹⁵ I have already discussed Brendan Byrne and James Scott's studies that argue for Jewish contexts in §1.1.1.¹⁶ In contrast, many understand υιοθεσία to come from a Greco-Roman context. Because υιοθεσία is not present in the LXX tradition and there are no formal adoption laws described in the legal material of the Jewish scriptures,¹⁷ scholars often turn to the contexts of either Roman or Greek law in order to understand the term.¹⁸ Trevor Burke is

¹⁴ Scott, *Adoption*, 56.

¹⁵ The term υιοθεσία is also used in Eph 1:4.

¹⁶ Others who argue for a Jewish context are C. E. B. Cranfield, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Epistle to the Romans*, 6th ed., vol. 1 of ICC (Edinburgh: Clark, 1975), 397–398; Joseph A. Fitzmyer, ed., *Romans: A New Translation and Commentary*, The Anchor Bible 33 (New York: Doubleday, 1993), 497–498; Robert Jewett, *Romans: A Commentary*, Hermeneia (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2007), 562–563; Moo, *Romans*, 501; Eduard Schweizer, "Υιοθεσία," *TDNT* VIII:399; N.T. Wright, "The Letter to the Romans: Introduction, Commentary, and Reflections," in *NIB*, vol. 10 of *NIB* (Nashville: Abingdon Press, 2002), 593. Schweizer notes the absence in the LXX and immediately turns to "sonship" language which, as in Rom 9:4, is closely associated with God's covenants and promises (Schweizer, "Υιοθεσία," 399). *GREEK-ENGLISH LEXICON OF THE NEW TESTAMENT*, s.v. "Adopt."

¹⁷ While the Greek and Roman cultures employed adoption in order to maintain the line of a male without progeny, the Israelites used levirate marriages to achieve the same function. For arguments that the HB/OT contains *examples* of adoption, if not adoption law, see Cyrus Herzl Gordon, "Biblical Customs and the Nuzu Tablets," *BA* 3.1 (1940): 1–12; William H. Russell, "New Testament Adoption — Graeco-Roman or Semitic," *JBL* 71.4 (1952): 233–34; Meir Malul, "Adoption of Foundlings in the Bible and Mesopotamian Documents: A Study of Some Legal Metaphors in Ezekiel 16:1-7," *JSOT* 46 (1990): 97–126; Scott, *Adoption*, 62–88. These adoption cases, however, have been disputed by Francis Lyall, "Roman Law in the Writings of Paul: Adoption," *JBL* 88.4 (1969): 458–464; Trevor J. Burke, *Adopted into God's Family: Exploring a Pauline Metaphor*, NSBT 22 (Nottingham: Apollos, 2006), 198–201.

¹⁸ In this section, I engage with scholars that read υιοθεσία against a specifically Roman legal context, though there has been recent work arguing for a Greek background to the term as used in Gal 4:5. In his 2010 doctoral dissertation Bradley Trick argues that υιοθεσία in Gal 4:5 should be understood as a Greek testamentary adoption as described by 4th century B.C.E. Athenian orators; "Sons, Seed, and Children of Promise in Galatians: Discerning the Coherence in Paul's Model of Abrahamic Descent" (Ph.D. diss., Duke University, 2010). My interactions are with the unpublished dissertation, but now see Bradley R. Trick, *Abrahamic Descent, Testamentary Adoption, and the Law in Galatians: Differentiating Abraham's Sons, Seed, and Children of Promise*, NovTSup 169 (Leiden: Brill, 2016). Trick is most persuasive in making his case when

representative of scholars who argue that Paul's adoption metaphor should be understood against the specific backdrop of the Roman *adoptio* procedure.¹⁹ The *adoptio* procedure transferred a son from one *patria potestas*—that is, the absolute and complete authority of a Roman father—to another.²⁰ The process involved a legal procedure derived from an ancient Roman law originating on the Twelve Tables. If a Roman father sold his son into slavery and the son was subsequently emancipated, the son would return back under his father's authority. The law, apparently to prevent abuse of this procedure, is recorded by Gaius as follows: "if a father sells his son three times, the son shall be free of the father" (*Inst.* 1.132; cf. Cicero, *Fin.* 1.7.24).²¹ Gaius then invoked this same law of emancipation in order to explain the process of adoption (*Inst.* 1.134). Before a praetor, the natural father would sell the son to a third-party friend who would immediately release the son from slavery. After this transaction was repeated two more times, the adopting father would claim authority over the adoptee, who had just been emancipated from his natural father's *patria potestas*. When no objections were brought forth by witnesses, the transfer of the son from one family to another was legally completed.

dealing with contextual clues from Galatians itself. Trick argues that διαθήκη (Gal 3:15, 17), παιδαγωγός (Gal 3:24), the child-heir under a guardian (Gal 4:1–2) metaphor, along with the υιοθεσία metaphor draw from a Hellenistic socio-legal background. This contextual evidence for the background of υιοθεσία, however, is not present in Romans.

¹⁹ Burke, *Adopted*, 60–68. See also Hester, *Inheritance*, 59; Francis Lyall, *Slaves, Citizens, Sons: Legal Metaphors in the Epistles* (Grand Rapids, Mich: Zondervan Pub. House, 1984), 99; Leon Morris, *The Epistle to the Romans*, PNTC (Cambridge: Eerdmans Publishing, 1988), 315. Commentators often recognize the Greco-Roman legal origin of the term, but persist in being open to other influences including HB/OT backgrounds; Cranfield, *Romans I–VIII*, 397–398; Moo, *Romans*, 501.

²⁰ The two literary sources which describe the process are Aulus Gellius in *Attic Nights* 5.19 and Gaius *Inst.* 1.132, 134. For discussions of the process as well as the other forms of Roman adoption termed *adrogatio*, see Lyall, *Slaves, Citizens, Sons*, 81–88; Burke, *Adopted*, 60–70; Scott, *Adoption*, 7–13; James C. Walters, "Paul, Adoption, and Inheritance," in *Paul in the Greco-Roman World: A Handbook*, ed. J. Paul Sampley (London: Trinity Press International, 2003), 44–55.

²¹ Gaius, *The Institutes of Gaius*, trans. Francis de Zulueta (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1946).

While Burke does not think scholars should be forced into an either/or question concerning the background of υιοθεσία, he does suggest that this particular Roman *adoptio* legal procedure is the most suitable background for understanding Paul's metaphor.²² Burke argues that Paul's allusion to *adoptio* would be an easily accessible socio-legal metaphor because 1) Paul was a Roman citizen, 2) the cities addressed in Paul's letters that employ the term—Romans, Galatians, and Ephesians—were under Roman rule, and 3) Roman adoption practices were well known in areas outside the imperial city due to adoption by Roman emperors.²³ Burke suggests that Roman *adoptio* and the Roman family structure more generally help to elucidate Paul's use of υιοθεσία in Gal 4 and Rom 8 because the father takes the initiative in the adoption,²⁴ the father as the *paterpotestas* possesses complete authority over the church as a family,²⁵ and Roman adoption of sons is closely linked with an inheritance.²⁶ To these more general correlations between Roman adoption and family structure, Burke further suggests that the specifics of the legal procedure of *adoptio* can be seen in Paul. For example, the movement from slavery to adoption is explained against the legal-fictive process described in the Roman literary sources in which the adoptive son is redeemed out of slavery three times over.²⁷ Similarly, Burke links the dual witness of

²² Burke, *Adopted*, 46.

²³ Burke, *Adopted*, 60–62. Burke seems to be following similar arguments to Lyall, “Roman Law”; Lyall, *Slaves, Citizens, Sons*.

²⁴ Burke, *Adopted*, 84–85.

²⁵ Burke, *Adopted*, 88.

²⁶ Burke, *Adopted*, 110.

²⁷ Burke, *Adopted*, 89, 119.

adoptive sonship by the Spirit and the human spirit in Rom 8:16 to the witnesses involved in an *adoptio* procedure.²⁸

These more specific points of contact between Paul's use of υιοθεσία and the details of *adoptio* can be challenged, however. The key weakness is that there is no clear evidence linking υιοθεσία to the specifically defined descriptions of *adoptio* in the Roman literary evidence upon which Burke draws. Rather, on the basis of attestations of υιοθεσία on papyri contracts, Marek Kurylowicz has concluded that "as to form and meaning, υιοθεσία has no place in the concept of Roman law; that, on the contrary, the elements of the formulation and the essence of υιοθεσία clearly reflect concepts drawn from local laws, and that here lies the source of its formulation."²⁹ That is, the attestations of υιοθεσία should probably be understood as referring to some undefined form of "common law" adoption specific to the region or city.³⁰

Studies such as Burke's draw out various valuable aspects of Paul's use of the adoption metaphor that would have been comprehended in Roman society, particularly the father's initiative in the adoptive process and the link with inheritance. Moreover, they guard against importing modern conceptions of adoption that are generally concerned with the wellbeing of infants and the children being adopted rather than the concern in the ancient

²⁸ Burke, *Adopted*, 150. Hester, too, sees the key elements of *adoptio* in Paul, though the witness of the Spirit as decisive. *Inheritance*, 59–61.

²⁹ "Adoption on the Evidence of the Papyri," *JJP* 19 (1983): 75. As discussed above, Scott also comes to similar conclusions.

³⁰ Thus, in his more recent study that examines the divine sonship metaphor, Michael Peppard argues for more modest conclusions than Burke with respect to the Roman legal context, focusing instead on Roman *ideals* concerning inheritance rather than the specifics of *adoptio* law. *The Son of God in the Roman World: Divine Sonship in Its Social and Political Context* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2011), 135. Peppard's study is more concerned to analyze the Gospel of Mark's use of divine sonship, though he does provide this brief analysis of Paul. See also a similar argument in Michael Peppard, "Adopted and Begotten Sons of God: Paul and John on Divine Sonship," *CBQ* 73.1 (2011): 92–110. Walters, too, draws more generally from similar motives, values, and underlying assumptions of both Greek and Romans law, thus speaking more broadly of Greco-Roman adoption; Walters, "Paul, Adoption, and Inheritance," 54–55.

world of establishing the lineage and heir for the father. One also cannot deny the ubiquitous nature of adoption in the Roman world and the general overlap between the ideology of Roman adoption and the Pauline metaphor. The diversity of adoption practices and the difficulty with linking υιοθεσία to any specific legal practice, however, warn against assigning too specific of a legal background unless contextual clues can be convincingly brought to bear. When the specific legal procedure of *adoptio* is removed, the Roman socio-legal background contributes only limited explanatory power despite the clear links. For instance, little is gained in understanding why Paul might define υιοθεσία as “the redemption of the body” in Rom 8:23 or why the term sits as the head of a list of Israel’s privileges in Rom 9:4. Byrne’s work, which I discussed earlier, provides a helpful contrast to Burke’s at this point. Byrne concludes that υιοθεσία should be contextualized with the Jewish sonship tradition because of its use in the list of traditional Jewish privileges in Rom 9:4.

Erin Heim’s recent doctoral thesis on the Pauline υιοθεσία metaphors³¹ cautions against posing a false dichotomy with regard to the background of Paul’s “adoption” metaphors. Her study includes a lengthy discussion of metaphor theory, with a particular emphasis on how “metaphors work to produce meaning and perception.”³² As a result of this preparatory work, one key aspect of Heim’s study distinguishes it from previous studies on adoption in Paul.³³ While at times other scholars have tried to argue for a single background

³¹ Heim argues that each usage of υιοθεσία needs to be understood in its own “utterance,” thus she speaks of Pauline υιοθεσία metaphors rather than a univocal υιοθεσία metaphor (Erin Heim, “Light through a Prism: New Avenues of Inquiry for the Pauline Υιοθεσία Metaphors” [Ph.D. thesis, University of Otago, 2014], 2, 49). Now also see the published version of the thesis, Erin M. Heim, *Adoption in Galatians and Romans: Contemporary Metaphor Theories and the Pauline Huiiothesia Metaphors*, Biblical Interpretation Series (Leiden: Brill, 2017).

³² Heim, “Prism,” 313.

³³ There are, of course other distinctives including the fact that Heim invests considerable effort into examining the effects—both cognitive and emotional—that the υιοθεσία metaphors may have elicited from their audience. Thus, when Heim approaches each passage, her analysis examines both textual features including an argument for the predominate model or background as well as a discussion of the possible effect the metaphor

for υιοθεσία, Heim contends the complexity of metaphor will not allow any of the purported backgrounds to be completely eliminated. Thus, she states, “one critical distinction between my methodological approach and that of previous studies is my assertion that a metaphor’s meaning cannot be reduced to its model (or background), nor is it possible to conclude that only one model is present to the exclusion of all others.”³⁴ Nevertheless, when Heim considers a particular text, the various frames or contexts can bring one model, such as Jewish sonship or Greco-Roman law, more to the fore while pushing another further into the background.

Concerning the occurrences of υιοθεσία in Rom 8 and 9, Heim argues that the dominant model for Rom 8:15 is Roman adoption because of the close connection to a series of other terms (πατήρ, κληρονόμοι).³⁵ Further, she suggests υιοθεσία in Rom 8:23 should also be understood against a Roman adoption model because of the unlikelihood that two metaphors in such close proximity would evoke entirely different models.³⁶ She then argues that the metaphors in Rom 8:15 and 23 emphasize the horizontal, familial relationships so that “believers in Rome process their community membership and their experiences of suffering, displacement, and hope.”³⁷ The metaphor in Rom 9:4, in contrast, is contained within a list of Israelite privileges so that “it is particularly likely here that both the Jewish sonship tradition and the Roman understanding of adoption hang together in a delicate

has on the audience’s perceptions, emotions, and identity. This second aspect of Heim’s study, however, is not of primary interest for me because 1) I am more concerned with understanding how Paul may have developed his own theology than with the rhetorical effect on the audience and 2) this portion of Heim’s study is inherently more speculative.

³⁴ Heim, “Prism,” 315.

³⁵ Heim, “Prism,” 204.

³⁶ Heim, “Prism,” 205.

³⁷ Heim, “Prism,” 316.

balance to form the metaphor's vehicle."³⁸ Because of the prominence of the Jewish sonship model, Heim dedicates a section to the development of the theme through the Jewish scriptures and Second Temple literature. While warning against a tight synthesis of the data, she reaches two broad conclusions: 1) the sonship terms applied to Israel all connote natural birth to some extent (the generic "son," πρωτότοκος, μονογενής) and never employ the lexical field of "adoption," and 2) the sonship metaphors in the Jewish scripture or Second Temple texts function as a familial description of YHWH's covenant relationship with Israel.³⁹ Crucially for Heim, Paul "reflects" the Jewish sonship traditions as both an inheritor and interpreter. Thus, in Rom 9:4, Paul retains the ideas of Israel's particularity, their covenant relationship with YHWH, and God's choice of Israel. Simultaneously, because Paul uniquely applies υιοθεσία to the sonship tradition, he "negates any sense of sonship being an *exclusive* privilege of the Israelites" and undercuts any sense of the "naturalness" of Israel's sonship.⁴⁰ Moreover, in Paul, the term "firstborn" (πρωτότοκος) is reserved only for Christ.⁴¹

Heim has provided an invaluable study for understanding how Paul's υιοθεσία metaphors function, particularly in regard to Paul's unique application of υιοθεσία to the Jewish sonship tradition and the innovations thus introduced. In so doing, her study has gone a long way towards explaining *why* Paul may have chosen the particular term υιοθεσία in Rom 9:4. Because of Paul's use of "adoption" for those in Christ in Rom 8 and Israel in Rom 9, Heim suggests the metaphors "may have functioned to draw the believers into the story of

³⁸ Heim, "Prism," 248.

³⁹ Heim, "Prism," 282–283.

⁴⁰ Heim, "Prism," 284–285. As Schweizer notes on the choice of υιοθεσία, "the sonship is not regarded as a natural one but as a sonship conferred by God's act." "Υιοθεσία," VIII:399.

⁴¹ Heim, "Prism," 285.

Israel, wherein all of the adopted sons stand in solidarity as children of Israel's God."⁴²

Moreover, I largely agree with Heim's insistence that one not choose one model of "adoption" to the exclusion of all others, and that each of Paul's "adoption" metaphors must be considered in its own contextual frame. This insight is significant to my argument that the "adoption" metaphors in Rom 8 and the one in Rom 9:4, while related to each other, are not necessarily equivalent.

Before leaving this discussion of υιοθεσία and Heim's work in particular, it should be noted that I do not think Heim has fully grasped the complexity of Paul's "adoption" metaphor in Rom 8:15 and 23. By emphasizing the Roman model due to the collocation of πατήρ and κληρονόμοι with υιοθεσία, Heim does not adequately recognize the elements in the context shared with the Jewish sonship model, particularly as expressed in *Jubilees*. I argue more fully in §6.2 that "adoption" and divine sonship more generally in Rom 8 are linked with the eschatological divine Spirit, the renewal of creation, and Abraham's descendants in an analogous way that the same series of motifs are collocated in *Jubilees*. Moreover, as Heim argues for the correspondence of models between Rom 8:15 and Rom 8:23 due to their proximity, one might ask if the same reasoning would warrant reading Rom 8:15 and 23 as drawing from the same model as Rom 9:4 because of its proximity and clarity.⁴³ Thus, agreeing with Heim that one need not choose either Roman legal backgrounds or the Jewish sonship texts, I suggest that bringing the Jewish sonship model more to the fore in Rom 8 helps to explain the rhetorical movement from celebration at the end of Rom 8 to the sorrow and heart anguish at the beginning of Rom 9 (§6.1).

⁴² Heim, "Prism," 308.

⁴³ This would require a *retrospective* clarifying or re-defining of terms, but this type of argumentation is not abnormal for Paul, as with the argument of Rom 1:18–32 when it turns in 2:1, and Rom 9:6–29 with its turn in v. 24.

I take up the occurrences of υιοθεσία from Rom 8 in the next chapter. For now, however, in this section I pick up Byrne and Heim’s readings of υιοθεσία in Rom 9:4 as foregrounding the Jewish sonship model. I argue that υιοθεσία in Rom 9:4 specifically refers to Israel’s ratification of the Sinai covenant when the people received the law. Paul deploys a term primarily found in a Greco-Roman legal context to describe an event in Israel’s history that is simultaneously legal and familial in nature because “adoption” corresponds with the legal and relational nature of the biblical covenants.

5.2.2 YIOΘEΣIA IN ROM 9:4–5

In Rom 9:4–5, Israel’s adoption as God’s son is the first of six privileges introduced by the second relative pronoun. The six privileges are grouped in two series of three, with each unit of the triads corresponding to each other based on their grammatical case and number endings: the adoption as son, the glory, and the covenants form the first triad; and the giving of the law, the worship, and the promises form the second.

ἡ υιοθεσία	ἡ δόξα	αἱ διαθήκαι
ἡ νομοθεσία	ἡ λατρεία	αἱ ἐπαγγελίαι

The structure of the privileges is so striking that some scholars have suggested the list represents a pre-existing tradition upon which Paul drew in order to describe the irony of his despair.⁴⁴ In the absence of further evidence, determinations of pre-existing traditions are tentative. Be that as it may, the pairs of privileges should be understood as mutually

⁴⁴ Byrne accepts the list of six privileges as a traditional formula emerging from Hellenistic Jewish circles, though the initial Ἰσραηλῖται and following comment on ὁ χριστός were Pauline additions (Byrne, *Sons of God*, 83–84). Piper considers the possibility the list was inherited by Paul, but instead opts for the view that Paul was the creator of the list, not least because of the unique religious usage of υιοθεσία found elsewhere only in Pauline literature (Piper, *Justification of God*, 22–23). So also Heikki Räisänen, “Paul, God, and Israel: Romans 9–11 in Recent Research,” in *Social World of Formative Christianity and Judaism: Essays in Tribute to Howard Clark Kee* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1988), 181 n. 26.

interpretive in the present context.⁴⁵ For the moment I leave to the side *υιοθεσία* and *νόμοθεσία*. The term *δόξα* alludes to and recalls the glory of God's presence.⁴⁶ According to the structure of the list, *δόξα* parallels *λατρεία*. The "worship" should be understood as the specific cultic worship held within the tabernacle or temple where the glory dwelt, as is a common use of the term in the LXX traditions (e.g., Exod 13:5; Josh 22:27; 1 Chron. 28:13).⁴⁷ The third pair of Israel's privileges are the "covenants" (*αἱ διαθήκαι*⁴⁸) and the "promises" (*αἱ ἐπαγγελίαι*). Setting aside which covenants are in mind for the moment, the conceptual link between God's covenants with his people and the divine promises entailed within these covenants is clear enough.⁴⁹ The mutually interpretive nature of the second and third pair of privileges in Rom 9:4, then, suggests a similar relationship may be operative between Israel's *υιοθεσία* and its parallel *ἡ νομοθεσία*, "the giving of the law."

⁴⁵ Thomas R. Schreiner, *Romans*, BECNT (Grand Rapids, Mich: Baker Books, 1998), 483–485.

⁴⁶ See, e.g., Exod 16:7, 10; 24:16; 40:34–35; Lev 9:6, 23; Num 14:10, 21; 16:19, 42; 1 Kings 8:11; Ezek 1:28. In light of the previous argument in Rom 5:2; 8:17, 18, 21, 30, Paul has in mind the outward manifestation of the divine radiance when he used the term *δόξα* in Rom 9:4, so Kittel, "Δόξα," *TDNT*, 2:244; Cranfield, *Romans IX–XVI*, 461–462; Dodd, *The Epistle of Paul to the Romans*, 151; Jewett, *Romans*, 563; Moo, *Romans*, 563; Morris, *Romans*, 348; John Murray, *The Epistle to the Romans*, NICNT (Grand Rapids, Mich: Eerdmans, 1968), 5. See especially Carey C. Newman, *Paul's Glory Christology: Tradition and Rhetoric*, NovTSup 69 (Leiden: Brill, 1992).

⁴⁷ H. Strathmann, "Λατρεύω, Λατρεία," *TDNT*, 4:65; Johannes P. Louw and Eugene A. Nida, eds., "Λατρεύω, Λατρεία," *Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament* (New York: United Bible Societies, 1989).

⁴⁸ There is textual evidence for the reading *ἡ διαθήκη* (P⁴⁶ B D^{gr} G) and this reading is accepted by Christiansen, *The Covenant in Judaism and Paul*, 220–228. The plural, however, should be adopted. This reading is supported by *κ C K Ψ* and is the more difficult reading because it breaks with the predominate LXX use of the singular; Byrne, *Sons of God*, 82 n. 11; Cranfield, *Romans IX–XVI*, 462; F. Godet, *Commentary on the Epistle to the Romans*, trans. A. Cusin and Talbot W. Chambers (Grand Rapids, Mich: Zondervan, 1956), 341; Jewett, *Romans*, 555; Bruce M. Metzger, *A Textual Commentary on the Greek New Testament* (Stuttgart: United Bible Societies, 1975), 519; Morris, *Romans*, 348; Munck, *Christ and Israel*, 31 n. 14; Ulrich Wilckens, *Der Brief an Die Römer (Röm 6–11)*, vol. 2 of *EKK 6* (Zürich: Benziger, 1980), 188 n 827; Wright, "Romans," 629.

⁴⁹ Ephesians 2:12 supports the conceptual link between "covenants" and "promises" with the phrase "covenants of promise." Schreiner, *Romans*, 485.

Commentators overwhelmingly agree that υιοθεσία here connotes the act of God taking the children of Israel as his own people.⁵⁰ Efforts to contextualize υιοθεσία have not often integrated the growing understanding of the link between kinship language and legal/covenant language.⁵¹ As F. M. Cross has shown in his seminal essay, “Kinship and Covenant in Ancient Israel,” familial language, i.e. the “kinship-in-flesh” language, was used in the realm of covenant language, i.e. the “kinship-in-law” language (cf. §2.2).⁵² Biblical covenants were essentially legal in nature while also containing relational aspects and language.⁵³ This blend of relational language and legal agreement appears in the biblical conception of marriage as a covenant, as shown by Gordon Hugenberger.⁵⁴ Similarly, *adoption* language evokes a concept that is simultaneously legal and relational, thus mapping well onto the concepts and language surrounding the covenant. This linking of relational and legal language in the context of God’s act of choosing Israel is found in Deut 32:2–9 LXX. Here, God’s truthfulness and faithfulness to the covenant are affirmed despite the sin of God’s “blemished children” (τέκνα μωμητά). The author questions unfaithful Israel, “Did not he himself, your father acquire you (ἐκτήσατό σε) and make you and create you? ... and his

⁵⁰ Dunn, *Romans 9-16*, 533; Fitzmyer, *Romans*, 545; Jewett, *Romans*, 562; Moo, *Romans*, 562; Morris, *Romans*, 384; Schreiner, *Romans*, 483; Stuhlmacher, *Romans*, 145.

⁵¹ There are, however, two works that draw on the link between legal and relational aspects in the concepts of covenant and adoption. Scott Hahn develops a biblical theology of the covenants in the OT and applies his findings to Luke–Acts, Gal 3–4, and Heb 1–9 (Scott Hahn, *Kinship by Covenant: A Canonical Approach to the Fulfillment of God’s Saving Promises*, The Anchor Yale Bible Reference Library [New Haven, Conn.: Yale University Press, 2009]). Grant Macaskill also identifies the contractual and relational nature of adoption as an important underlying idea which reinforces the social dimensions of the covenant which binds covenant partners to God as well as each other. Thus, the category of adoption has a key link to the covenant for Macaskill (*Union*, 104–105).

⁵² Cross, “Kinship,” 11.

⁵³ George Wesley Buchanan, “The Covenant in Legal Context,” in *Concept of the Covenant in the Second Temple Period* (Leiden: Brill, 2003), 27–52.

⁵⁴ Gordon Hugenberger, *Marriage as a Covenant: A Study of Biblical Law and Ethics Governing Marriage Developed, from the Perspective of Malachi*, Supplements to Vetus Testamentum v. 52 (New York: Brill, 1994).

people Iakob became the Lord's portion, Israel a measured part of his inheritance" (vv. 6b, 9).⁵⁵ The familial father-children language is seamlessly linked with the legal language of God's acquisition of Israel as his people. To employ Heim's concept of Paul's both inheriting and reflecting the Jewish sonship tradition, the Apostle's unique application of the Greco-Roman legal term υιοθεσία to the sonship tradition captures both the relational and legal natures of Israel's sonship through covenant. More specifically, υιοθεσία depicts the legal ratification of a new familial relationship.

The term νομοθεσία can refer to the general notion of "legislation,"⁵⁶ or it can refer to the more specific act of "the giving of the law."⁵⁷ A decision between the two is difficult, but one reason makes it more likely that Paul has in mind the "giving of the law" associated with the covenant at Sinai. Paul likely uses νομοθεσία in distinction from νόμος because throughout Romans the latter term is highly nuanced. Paul can say that "the law came in so that transgression may increase" (Rom 5:20), and that sin no long has mastery over believers because they "are not under law" (Rom 6:14). Consequently, Paul must also argue that the law is not sin (Rom 7:7) nor is it death (Rom 7:13), but rather the law is intended for life (Rom 7:10), "holy" (Rom 7:13), and "spiritual" (Rom 7:14). The ambivalence surrounding the law is not with its nature or origins, but rather with sin's use of the law (7:8–11).⁵⁸ So, when Paul wants to emphasize the divine gift and privilege conferred, he opts for νομοθεσία

⁵⁵ Translation from *A New English Translation of the Septuagint*.

⁵⁶ W. Gutbrod concludes that the term "usually connotes, not the act of legislation, but the result of this act, i.e., the law" based on 2 Macc. 6:23; 4 Macc. 5:35; 17.16, *TDNT*, 4:1089. Also, Byrne, *Sons of God*, 82 n. 12; Cranfield, *Romans IX–XVI*, 462–463; Fitzmyer, *Romans*, 546. Piper argues that νομοθεσία is used primarily to match υιοθεσία; Piper, *Justification of God*, 36.

⁵⁷ Godet, *Commentary on the Epistle to the Romans*, 341; Jewett, *Romans*, 564; *GREEK-ENGLISH LEXICON OF THE NEW TESTAMENT* 1, s.v. "Νομοθετέω, Νομοθεσία"; Moo, *Romans*, 563–4; *THE VOCABULARY OF THE GREEK TESTAMENT*, s.v. "Νομοθεσία"; Munck, *Christ and Israel*, 31–32; Scott, *Adoption*, 148–149.

⁵⁸ For further defense of these interpretations, see §6.2.1.2.

rather than νόμος to highlight the moment of the giving of the law unadulterated by the weakness of the flesh.⁵⁹

The structure of Rom 9:4, then, suggests that ἡ υἰοθεσία and ἡ νομοθεσία are a mutually interpretive pair that together connote the legal ratification of a familial relationship. In other words, Paul uses υἰοθεσία to evoke an event in which Israel's covenant relationship with God was legally formalized with the giving of the law on Mt. Sinai.⁶⁰

Interpreters recognize that the list of privileges in Rom 9:4–5 has an overall “Exodus” ring to it.⁶¹ Because of its significance to my argument, however, I highlight here three points that further bolster this conclusion.⁶² First, Paul's desire to be cut off from Christ for the sake of his kinsmen resonates with Moses' intercession on behalf of Israel after the Golden Calf incident recorded in Exod 32–34. Moses attempts to atone (ἐξιλάσῃμαι) for the sin of the people by pleading for forgiveness; if, however, God will not relent, Moses asks that he too be blotted out of the book of life along with the people (Exod 32:30–32).⁶³ Second, Paul goes on to quote Exod 33:19 directly in the near context: “For he says to Moses, ‘I will have mercy on whom I have mercy, and I will have compassion on whom I have compassion’”

⁵⁹ Cf. Israel's “advantage” in Rom 3:2: ἐπιστεύθησαν τὰ λόγια τοῦ θεοῦ. Moo, *Romans*, 564.

⁶⁰ Abasciano similarly concludes that υἰοθεσία designates covenantal election and, further, encapsulates the remainder of the privileges in Rom 9:4–5 because the links to the Sinai and Golden Calf incidents help to zero in on the *primary* meaning of each term (*Paul's Use of the Old Testament in Romans 9.1-9: An Intertextual and Theological Exegesis*, 1st ed. (T&T Clark, 2006), 122–124). See also C. K. Barrett, *A Commentary on the Epistle to the Romans*, Black's New Testament Commentaries (London: A & C Black, 1971), 177; Dunn, *Romans 9-16*, 533; Schreiner, *Romans*, 483; Walter, “Zur Interpretation von Römer 9-11,” 183–184.

⁶¹ Byrne, *Sons of God*, 84. Cf. N.T. Wright, “New Exodus, New Inheritance: The Narrative Substructure of Romans 3-8,” in *Romans and the People of God: Essays in Honor of Gordon D Fee on the Occasion of His 65th Birthday* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1999), 34.

⁶² Here I follow Abasciano, who argues that Exod 32:32 provides the primary echo in Rom 9:3, and, more broadly, Exod 32–34 provides the interpretive key for Rom 9:1–5. Using Hays' categories for detecting echoes, Abasciano points to the thematic coherence, the volume, and recurrence (Rom 9:15 quoting Exod 33:19) in order to establish the link between Rom 9:1–5 and Exod 32–34 despite the lack of verbal similarities, *Romans 9.1-9*, 72. See also Munck, *Christ and Israel*, 29; Wagner, *Heralds*, 46.

⁶³ John M. G. Barclay, *Paul and the Gift* (Grand Rapids, Michigan: Eerdmans Publishing Co, 2015), 521–522; Cranfield, *Romans IX-XVI*, 454–456; Jewett, *Romans*, 560–561; Wilckens, *Römer 6-11*, 187.

(Rom 9:15). Third, Moses' dialogue with God overlaps thematically with Paul's concern throughout Rom 9–11: will God remain faithful to Israel despite their apostasy from him? So then, Paul is drawing on language from the covenant-making event on Sinai in order to describe his lament over the current state of Israel.⁶⁴ The common strand that ties the list of privileges together is *God's covenant relationship with Israel at Sinai*.

Heim objects to understanding υιοθεσία in Rom 9:4 as specifically recalling the ratification of the Sinai covenant for several interesting reasons.⁶⁵ First, there is no OT occurrence where Israel *becomes* God's son, rather it is *assumed* that Israel is God's son (Exod 4:22; Deut 8:5; 14:1–2; Mal 1:6). Second, the primary occurrence used to support Israel's "adoption" as happening at Sinai is Exod 4:22. Heim points out, however, that the giving of the law occurs much later in the narrative after God delivered Israel, his firstborn son, from slavery. Third, Heim suggests that if Paul were to pin-point a moment when Israel became God's son, it would seem more natural to link the event with the ratification of the covenant with Abraham (Gen 12:1–2; 17:1–14).

It is true that we search in vain for a passage in the Jewish scriptures that describes Israel becoming God's son. It is simply assumed. As Heim herself has shown, however, Paul not only inherits but also reflects the sonship tradition found in the Jewish scripture and Second Temple texts. Paul, himself, may in fact be introducing the idea that Israel was "adopted" into the Sinai covenant with the giving of the law, as is suggested by placing Israel's υιοθεσία in parallel with Israel's νομοθεσία. More significantly, Heim's comments serve to locate Paul's reflection of the Jewish sonship tradition within a broader Jewish

⁶⁴ Wagner connects Paul's discussion to the broader context of the Golden Calf incident because of the allusion to Moses' intercession, the shared link of divine mercy, the declaration of God's name, and the direct citation of Exod 33:19; *Heralds*, 51–56. He concludes: "at the point in the exodus narrative where Israel has failed utterly, God remains faithful—not because of human willing or striving, not because of Israel's merit, but because of God's own mercy" (pg. 56).

⁶⁵ Heim, "Prism," 249–250.

concern: how could Abraham serve as the beginning of God's covenant people long before the giving of the law on Sinai? In other words, Heim's second and third points highlight a problem for any reader of the Pentateuch who assumed a link between the covenant, the law, and Israel's sonship. Francis Watson, Michael Segal, and James Kugel have shown that the unbreakable link between the law and covenant relationship was a driving concern for *Jubilees* (see my arguments in §2.2.1.2). If Israel was God's firstborn son, that is, chosen for covenant relationship from the week of creation, then the covenant stipulations of the law must also have existed from the same time. Thus, for *Jubilees*, the heavenly tablets serve as the eternal covenant stipulations that correspond to the eternal covenant. Both Paul and *Jubilees* appear to link the Sinai covenant with giving of the law. Yet, while *Jubilees* concludes that the covenant and, therefore, the law are eternal, Paul understands the law to have come into existence sometime after creation (Rom 5:13; Gal 3:17). This, along with his novel use of *υιοθεσία* in Rom 9:4 to describe Israel's filial relationship to God, suggests that Paul understood the giving of the law to mark Israel's ratification of the Sinai covenant, that is, its adoption as God's son associated with the law.

One final issue to be addressed is if *υιοθεσία* in Rom 9:4 does designate the ratification of the Sinai covenant, why does Paul also refer to multiple "covenants" and "promises"? There is considerable speculation as to why Paul uses the plural "covenants" and to which covenants he refers,⁶⁶ but I highlight two points here. Regardless of the nature of the "covenants," other contextual clues (*νομοθεσία* and allusions to Exod 32–34) suggest that the Sinai covenant, at the very least, should be considered primary. Second, for Paul, "promise"

⁶⁶ Commentators generally fall out into five categories on the question of to what the plural "covenants" refers: 1) The old and new covenants, Dunn, *Romans 9-16*, 534; 2) the iterations of the Sinai covenant, Barrett, *Romans*, 166; 3) covenants made with Abraham, Moses, and David, Cranfield, *Romans IX-XVI*, 2:462; Murray, *Romans*, 5; Wright, "Romans," 10:629; 4) all the biblical covenants between God and Israel except the New Covenant, Morris, *Romans*, 348; or 5) all the biblical covenants, including the New Covenant, Moo, "Roman 9-11," 563; Piper, *Justification of God*, 34–35; Jewett, *Romans*, 563–564.

has taken on the special significance of distinguishing the covenant with Abraham from the covenant of law (Rom 4:13ff.; cf. Gal 3:18). Therefore, it is likely that Paul understood the “covenants” linked with the “promises” to be the covenant scenes involving the patriarchs Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob. In other words, the Sinai covenant members, who received the “adoption” linked with “the giving of the law,” are the heirs in the ancestral line of patriarchs with whom God made covenants and gave promises. Paul restates a similar idea in v. 5 when he situates Israel in the family-line between the patriarchs and Christ.

Israel’s “adoption” in Rom 9:4, then, is the legal ratification of the Sinai covenant as marked by the “giving of the law.” Here, Paul is maintaining a delicate balance because his “kinsmen according to the flesh” are genuine recipients of divine blessing. Israel retains all the privileges of vv. 4–5 and stands in the family-line between the patriarchs and Christ. Nevertheless, Paul’s great despair emerges because many of his kinsmen have not progressed to the eschatological culmination of God’s blessings. That is, they currently stand cut off from Christ and related to him merely *κατὰ σάρκα*. Indeed, as argued below, in the next section of Paul’s argument he creates a distinction between the Sinai covenant described in Rom 9:4 and the Abrahamic descendants described in Rom 9:8ff.

5.3 GOD’S SONS, ABRAHAM’S SEED IN ROMANS 9:8

I have argued above that the “adoption-law giving” pair of Rom 9:4 should be understood as a reference to the ratification of the Sinai covenant established with the giving of the Torah. The second divine sonship reference in the section comes in Rom 9:8. I argue that Paul once again uses divine sonship language to designate covenant members, but here the discussion specifically concerns Abraham’s seed. Thus, I argue that Paul distinguishes between those

who have received the νοιοθεσία-νομοθεσία Sinai privileges of Rom 9:4 from those who are the children of God through the promise in Rom 9:8.

Romans 9:6a states the thesis of the section (vv. 6–29) succinctly: “It is not as though the word of God had failed.”⁶⁷ Paul’s opening support (Rom 9:6b–13) for the thesis essentially works to define more precisely the identity⁶⁸ of those chosen for covenant relationship:

For not all from Israel are Israel, and not all of Abraham’s children are his descendants;⁶⁹ but “It is through Isaac that descendants shall be named for you.” This means that it is not the children of the flesh who are the children of God, but the children of the promise are counted as descendants. (Rom 9:6b–8)

Paul’s logic denies the equation of related categories in order to support his thesis. In so doing, Paul restates his argument in several different forms. Within these restatements, Paul reveals his assumption that the “children of God” are equivalent to “Abraham’s seed.” I display the text below in order to show the equivalent categories more clearly.

9:6b	γὰρ	
9:7a	οὐδ’ ὅτι	οὐ πάντες οἱ ἐξ Ἰσραὴλ [εἰσὶν] οὗτοι Ἰσραήλ· πάντες τέκνα εἰσὶν σπέρμα Ἀβραάμ,

⁶⁷ Cranfield, *Romans IX–XVI*, 473; Dunn, *Romans 9–16*, 539; Flebbe, *Solus Deus*, 275; Linebaugh, *God, Grace, and Righteousness*, 183; Eduard Lohse, *Der Brief an Die Römer* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2003), 270; Jewett, *Romans*, 573.

⁶⁸ Barclay makes the helpful distinction that Paul’s primary concern is not necessarily the identity of the elect but the *means* of their election (John M. G. Barclay, “‘I Will Have Mercy on Whom I Have Mercy’: The Golden Calf and Divine Mercy in Romans 9–11 and Second Temple Judaism,” *Early Christianity* 1, no. 1 (2010): 98; cf. also Barclay, *Gift*, 526–530.); while this analysis is helpful, I do not see a significant difference once the threads of means and identity are re-synthesized. The basis of election works to distinguish the identity of those who are truly elect over against those who are not.

⁶⁹ Hays rightly critiques the RSV translation of Rom 9:7 for reversing the terms (“and not all are children [τέκνα] of Abraham because they are his descendants [σπέρμα]”) and thus rendering Paul’s argument incoherent (*Echoes*, 65 fn. 61), particularly because the following quotation of Gen 21:12 identifies Isaac with the “seed” (σπέρμα). So, Flebbe, *Solus Deus*, 279–280; Jewett, *Romans*, 575; Moo, *Romans*, 575; Wright, “Romans,” 636; Wright, *Paul and the Faithfulness*, 1188. *Pace* those who see σπέρμα changing referents, first as natural seed and later as promised seed: Byrne, *Sons of God*, 130–131; Cranfield, *Romans IX–XVI*, 473; Dodd, *The Epistle of Paul to the Romans*, 155; Godet, *Commentary on the Epistle to the Romans*, 347; Morris, *Romans*, 353; Murray, *Romans*, 10; William Sanday and Arthur Cayley Headlam, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Epistle to the Romans*, ICC (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1895), 240–241.

9:7b ἄλλ', ἐν Ἰσαὰκ κληθήσεται σοι σπέρμα.
 9:8a τοῦτ' ἔστιν,
 οὐ τὰ τέκνα τῆς σαρκὸς ταῦτα τέκνα τοῦ θεοῦ
 9:8b ἄλλὰ
 τὰ τέκνα τῆς ἐπαγγελίας λογίζεται εἰς σπέρμα.

Romans 9:7a is a restatement of 9:6b, so that those who are Israel are also the descendants of Abraham. The distinction is between the physical descendants of Israel and the Israel of faith.⁷⁰ Paul has already distinguished between circumcision accompanied by faith and that which is not in Rom 4:12. Here Paul maintains the same distinction so that not all physical descendants of Israel are Israel, nor are all physical children of Abraham included in Abraham's seed.

Paul supports these category distinctions with a quotation of Gen 21:12, "It is through Isaac that descendants shall be named for you." Verse 8 gives Paul's interpretation of the Genesis citation. Here Paul replaces the "children of God" in the negative contrast (9:8a) with what he considers to be the equivalent category of Abraham's "descendants" in the positive affirmation (9:8b). In other words, Paul equates the categories of "the children of God" and "Abraham's descendants." Noting that Paul has introduced the concept of divine sonship into Gen 21 with no effort to explain the interjection, Charles Wanamaker concludes, "This suggests that Paul assumed that divine sonship, a concept drawn from the Old Testament, was

⁷⁰ It is likely the modifier "true Israel" should be brought out in translation because of Paul's word play in Rom 9:6. Paul here distinguishes between physical descendants of Israel and the Israel of faith, as he does in Rom 4:12. Dunn, *Romans 9-16*, 539; Fitzmyer, *Romans*, 559–560; Scott J. Hafemann, "The Salvation of Israel in Romans 11:25-32: A Response to Krister Stendahl," *Ex Auditu* 4 (1988): 44; Schreiner, *Romans*, 493; Wright, "Romans," 635–636. In contrast, Barclay contends that ἐξ Ἰσραὴλ does not have a partative sense here and, thus "is not to be taken as a denial that all *within* (the present) Israel are (truly) Israel, but as a denial that Israel has been constituted by ethnic descent"; Barclay, *Gift*, 530 n. 23. The language of Israel's diminished numbers throughout Rom 9–11 (e.g. 9:27–28, 29; 11:1–2), however, suggest that Paul does have in mind a select few from within Israel.

a fundamental category for understanding the relation of the elect to God.”⁷¹ Moreover, as the argument develops, the category of divine sonship is naturally connected to the descendants of Abraham who are the product of the divine promise (v.8) and calling (v. 12). In other words, on the level of assumption for Paul, “children of God” and “the descendants of Abraham” were equivalent categories that designated God’s chosen people.

Paul’s argument, then, works by distinguishing those who are “kinsmen according to the flesh” and possess the “adoption-giving of the law” (vv. 3–5) from those who are children of God through promise (vv. 6b–8). Put another way, the word of God has not fallen because not all those “adopted” into the Sinai covenant are the children of God equated with Abraham’s seed.⁷² Certainly the categories are related. Ἰσραήλ is a subcategory of οἱ ἐξ Ἰσραήλ; the σπέρμα Ἀβραάμ is a subcategory of the patriarch’s τέκνα; and the τέκνα τοῦ θεοῦ/τῆς ἐπαγγελίας are subcategories of the τέκνα τῆς σαρκός. So, these designations of the larger category are equated with those who have received the adoption marked by the giving of the law in Rom 9:4. Some view the distinction between empirical Israel of Rom 9:4 and the true Israel of Rom 9:6–8 as a distinction between elect and non-elect.⁷³ Cranfield distinguishes the “children of God” in v. 8 from those who have the adoption in v. 4 by suggesting different forms or levels of election.⁷⁴ On my reading, which distinguishes a

⁷¹ Charles A. Wanamaker, “The Son and the Sons of God: A Study in the Elements of Paul’s Christological and Soteriological Thought” (Ph.D. diss., University of Durham, 1980), 367.

⁷² Pace Wagner, *Heralds*, 49–50. Recognizing the redefinition of Abraham’s seed as the children of promise, Wagner fails to distinguish between the “children of God” in the re-definition and Israel’s adoption in Rom 9:4: “Consequently, the privilege of ‘adoption as sons’ (υἰοθεσία), that is, of being τέκνα τοῦ θεοῦ—said in 9:3–4 to belong to Paul’s kinspeople κατὰ σάρκα, the “Israelites”—actually belongs not to the “children of the flesh,” but only to those descendants of Abraham who are ‘children of promise.’” Wagner fails to take into account Paul’s *present tense* description of his kinsmen possessing the status of Israelite and the list of privileges.

⁷³ Munck, *Christ and Israel*, 35–36; Räisänen, “Paul, God, and Israel,” 182.

⁷⁴ *Romans IX–XVI*, 471, 475. Cranfield makes this distinction primarily to do justice to Israel’s present tense possession of the privileges.

sonship of the Sinai covenant (v. 4) from the sonship of the Abrahamic covenant (v. 8), one can understand how Paul is able to assert that the kinsmen according to the flesh currently possess the privileges of the Sinai covenant while still being cut off from Christ. While the author of *Jubilees* links the biblical covenants into one, Paul maintains a distinction between Sinai covenant members and Abraham's descendants (cf. Rom 4:11–12; Gal 3:15–18).⁷⁵

By identifying precisely which “word of God” Paul is considering in vv. 6–13, one can corroborate that Paul has transitioned to considering Abraham's descendants. Morris argues that the “word of God” in this context principally means “all God's promises” to Israel.⁷⁶ Other scholars understand God's word here to mean the proclamation of the gospel, as the phrase does often in other Pauline texts.⁷⁷ In this case, according to Jewett, Rom 9:6 is a defense of “the main thesis of Rom 1:16–17 concerning the gospel as the ‘power of God’ capable of setting right the entire world.”⁷⁸ Wright argues that the theme of God's word accomplishing its purpose looks back to Isa 55:11 and 40:8.⁷⁹ These options are not necessarily mutually exclusive, especially when one continues to bear in mind that Paul's

⁷⁵ Thus, Räisänen is misleading when he says that Paul merely “pays lip service to Israel's privileges in 9:4–5” in light of Rom 9:6–13, 2 Cor 3, and Phil 3; “Paul, God, and Israel,” 181. The comparison in 2 Cor 3:7–11 is between the glory of the Sinai covenant which brought death and the greater glory of the new covenant which brings life. Similarly, according to my argument here, the comparison in Rom 9 is between the privileges in the Sinai covenant for those only connected to Christ according to the flesh and the greater privileges who are truly descendants of Abraham. According to Paul in both passages, the glory and privileges of the Sinai covenant are genuine but not eschatological.

⁷⁶ Morris, *Romans*, 352. Also, Cranfield, *Romans IX–XVI*, 473; Dunn, *Romans 9–16*, 573; Godet, *Commentary on the Epistle to the Romans*, 346; Moo, *Romans*, 573; Munck, *Christ and Israel*, 34; Piper, *Justification of God*, 48–50; Byrne, *Sons of God*, 128 n. 200. Murray thinks the “word” here needs to be taken specifically as the “covenants alluded to in verse 4”; *Romans*, 9. Sanday and Headlam take the phrase as “the declared purpose of God whether a promise or a threat or a decree”; *Romans*, 240.

⁷⁷ E.g. 1 Cor 14:36; 2 Cor 17; 4:2. Jewett, *Romans*, 574.

⁷⁸ Jewett, *Romans*, 574.

⁷⁹ Wright, “Romans,” 635.

gospel was “promised beforehand through his prophets in the holy scripture” concerning God’s son, the descendant of David (Rom 1:2–3).

I suggest that when one considers what the divine speech accomplishes in Rom 9, that the “word of God” in Rom 9:6 is the promise of descendants spoken to Abraham by the creative and life-giving God.⁸⁰ Drawing from Gen 21:12, Paul speaks of Abraham’s descendants being called (κληθήσεται) into being by God (Rom 9:7). Paul’s explanation (τοῦτ’ἔστιν) of Gen 21:12 follows by contrasting the children of the flesh with the children of the promise in Rom 9:8. As Barclay observes about the phrase τέκνα τῆς ἐπαγγελίας, “[d]ivine promises, it appears, *give birth*: they create the reality they promise.”⁸¹ Only the children brought about by God’s spoken promise are reckoned (λογίζεται) as Abraham’s descendants. Paul then defines more precisely the promise (ἐπαγγελίας γὰρ ὁ λόγος οὗτος) in v. 9 with a mixed quotation of Gen 18:10, 14: “About this time I will return and Sarah shall have a son.” Paul is concerned to show that God would, by his power and because of his promise, fulfill his promise of descendants to Abraham even in the face of impossible circumstances from the perspective of the flesh. Continuing with the theme of God’s spoken word, the selection of Jacob over Esau was effected by “the one who calls” (καλοῦντος) rather than by works, thus ensuring that God’s elective purpose would remain (Rom 9:11–12). Finally, in light of Paul’s defense of God’s freedom in showing mercy, he draws out the conclusion that God called (ἐκάλεσεν) vessels of glory from both Jews as well the Gentiles (Rom 9:24). Throughout, Paul appears to be considering God’s promise of descendants to Abraham making him the father of many nations. Indeed, the assurance of a remnant from

⁸⁰ C. Hodge briefly mentions the same conclusion without further comment: “The *word of God* means anything which God has spoken, and here, from the connection, the promise made to Abraham, including the promise of salvation through Jesus Christ”; *Commentary on the Epistle to the Romans* (Grand Rapids, Mich: Eerdmans, 1972), 305.

⁸¹ Barclay, “I Will Have Mercy,” 99. Emphasis original.

Israel spoken through the words of Isa 10:22 and 1:9 constituted, for Paul, the Lord quickly and completely fulfilling his word (λόγον...ποιήσει κύριος). In other words, Abraham will have descendants from both Gentiles and Jews, thus linking back to the thesis statement in Rom 9:6.

Thus, identifying the “word of God” as the promise of descendants spoken to Abraham confirms that Paul has switched from the Sinai covenant in Rom 9:4–5 to the Abrahamic covenant in Rom 9:6bff. If we draw back to the larger picture, then we can see that the ironic circumstance described in Rom 9:1–5 has in no way called into question God’s word of promise spoken to Abraham (Rom 9:6–29). In other words, the fact that some members of the Sinai covenant currently stand cut off from Christ does not call into question God’s promise to Abraham of descendants from all the nations. For Paul, the recipients of the privileges listed in Rom 9:4–5 are kindred of Christ according to the flesh by a covenant ratified with the giving of the law. In contrast, Abraham’s seed have always been descendants according to the promise, including both circumcised and uncircumcised.

5.4 CHILDREN OF THE LIVING GOD: HOSEA 2:25; 1:10 IN ROMANS 9:24–26

The final occurrence of divine sonship language in Rom 9 is in Paul’s mixed quotation of Hosea 2:23 (2:25 LXX) and 1:10b (2:1b LXX) introduced and cited in Rom 9:24–26. The Hosea quotations along with citations from Isaiah in Rom 9:27–29 serve to close off the argument that began in Rom 9:6. Paul evokes the prophet as a witness in order to provide scriptural support for his defense of God’s freedom to make both vessels of wrath and glory.⁸² Indeed, the quick and complete execution of the Lord’s “word” (λόγον) that diminished Israel’s number to a remnant (σπέρμα) in vv. 27–29 serves as an appropriate close to the

⁸² Moo notes that 9:24–26 is the resumption of the argument left behind from Rom 9:6–13, with vv. 14–23 viewed as a closely connected excursus. *Romans*, 610.

defense of “word of God” started in v. 6. N.T. Wright observes that there is the “dense web of textual echoes” that link vv. 25–29 back to the beginning of the argument in Rom 9:6 through Abrahamic themes.⁸³ Though the Lord’s judgment has reduced the number, the Lord’s word has not fallen because the descendants of Abraham remain.

The Hosea quotations serve as the support for a sudden reversal in Paul’s argumentation introduced in Rom 9:24, where Paul asserts that God has called Jews and Gentiles to glory and mercy. To this point in the argument, Paul has highlighted God’s sovereignty in selection. God has freedom to select Isaac (vv. 7), to choose Jacob rather than Esau (vv. 10–13), and to have mercy on some (vv. 14–18). So it is startling when Paul invokes this same divine sovereignty to argue that God can also freely choose *to expand* the objects of mercy to include both Jews and Gentiles. The Hosea texts then serve as Paul’s scriptural grounding for the claim.

As indeed he says in Hosea, “Those who were not my people I will call ‘my people,’ and her who was not beloved I will call ‘beloved.’” And in the very place where it was said to them, ‘You are not my people,’ there they shall be called children of the living God.” (Rom 9:25–26)

ὥς καὶ ἐν τῷ Ὡσηὲ λέγει· καλέσω τὸν οὐ λαὸν μου λαὸν μου καὶ τὴν οὐκ ἡγαπημένην ἡγαπημένην· καὶ ἔσται ἐν τῷ τόπῳ οὗ ἐρρέθη αὐτοῖς· οὐ λαός μου ὑμεῖς, ἐκεῖ κληθήσονται υἱοὶ θεοῦ ζῶντος. (Rom 9:25–26)

To be more precise, Paul does not necessarily cite Hosea as witness as much as he presents the prophetic text as the vehicle by which the divine speech can be heard as witness.⁸⁴ The speaker to be heard in Hosea is the living God who calls (καλέσω) his people into existence, conceptually parallel to the God who calls into being things that are not and gives life to the

⁸³ The echoes include 1) “sand of the sea” in Isa 10:22–23; Hos 1:10; Gen 22:17; 2) σπέρμα linking v. 28 with Abraham’s σπέρμα in vv. 6–8; 3) mention of Sodom and Gomorrah, Gen 19:29. Wright, “Romans,” 643.

⁸⁴ Jewett rightly comments: “The verb λέγει should not be translated with the neutral expression ‘it says’ but with ‘he says,’ corresponding to her call in v. 24”; *Romans*, 599.

dead (Rom 4:17).⁸⁵ Wagner correctly concludes that in the quotation, “Paul subverts any conception of Israel’s election that would deny the blessing of Abraham to Gentiles *qua* Gentiles.”⁸⁶

There are a number of thematic and verbal links between Rom 9 and the surrounding verses between Hos 1:10 LXX and Hos 2:23 LXX, indicating that Paul was aware of the broader context from which the quotations from Hosea originated. Gomer’s daughter is named “Not-mercied” (οὐκ ἠλεημένη, Hos 1:6 LXX), though the Lord will eventually have mercy on Judah again (Hos 1:7 LXX). In his earlier discussion of Pharaoh in Rom 9:15–18, Paul emphasizes God’s freedom to have mercy on whomever he pleases (θέλει ἐλεεῖ, v. 18). Moreover, both Hosea and Paul highlight that no human effort can be construed as the cause of this freely given divine mercy.⁸⁷ Hosea 1:10 LXX opens with the remark that the number of the sons of Israel shall be as the sand of the sea. Paul attributes to Isaiah his scriptural citation in Rom 9:27–28 and, indeed, much of the wording is shared by Isa 10:22–23; nevertheless, the first part of the quotation also shares the exact wording of Hos 1:10 LXX.⁸⁸

⁸⁵ Jewett, *Romans*, 600. Paul’s citation of Hosea differs from the LXX version of Hosea 2:23; 1:10 in two significant ways. The order of Hos 2:23 is inverted in Paul’s citation and Hosea’s ἐρῶ is replaced by καλέσω. Jewett lists Hosea 2:25b–c in a helpful side-by-side comparison with Rom 9:25b–26, *ibid.*, 599. Sarah Whittle, *Covenant Renewal and the Consecration of the Gentiles in Romans*, SNTSMS 161 (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2015), 34. For detailed arguments concerning which differences Paul may have introduced into his *Vorlage*, see Wagner, *Heralds*, 80–85. While it is difficult to determine whether or not Paul introduced the word change to καλέσω, if the Apostle was responsible, it would certainly fit with the broader significance of the divine “calling” in Rom 9. Indeed, Wagner is correct to observe that the citation as it exists within Rom 9 fits remarkably well with the “argumentative fabric.”

⁸⁶ Wagner, *Heralds*, 83.

⁸⁷ Hosea 2:7 LXX “But I will have pity (ἐλεήσω) on the sons of Ioudas, and I will save them by the Lord, their God, and I will not save them by bow or by sword or by war or by chariots or by horses or by horsemen” (NETS).

⁸⁸ For a detailed discussion of the conflated citations from Hosea and Isaiah, see Wagner, *Heralds*, 78, 89–100; D.-A Koch, *Die Schrift Als Zeuge Des Evangeliums: Untersuchungen Zur Verwendung Und Zum Verständnis Der Schrift Bei Paulus*, BHT 69 (Tübingen: Mohr-Siebeck, 1986), 168. For our purposes, it is enough to see that Paul is aware of the specific wording of verses surrounding his citations of Hosea. The verses read as follows:

Hosea 1:10a LXX: καὶ ἦν ὁ ἀριθμὸς τῶν υἱῶν Ἰσραὴλ ὡς ἡ ἄμμος τῆς θαλάσσης
Rom 9:27b: ἐὰν ᾗ ὁ ἀριθμὸς τῶν υἱῶν Ἰσραὴλ ὡς ἡ ἄμμος τῆς θαλάσσης

Finally, Hosea describes Israel encountering divinely ordained hindrances in her path:

“Therefore, behold I am hedging up her way with thorns and will build up her ways, and she will not find her path” (Hos 2:6 LXX, NETS). Likewise, Paul pictures Israel stumbling over the stone God himself placed in her path (Rom 9:30–33). This evidence suggests that Paul was aware of the context of Hosea.

Because it appears that Paul has chosen texts from Hosea with an awareness of their context, it is fruitful to draw out the parallels between Paul’s discussion and Hosea.⁸⁹ The opening chapters of Hosea relate the word of the Lord spoken to the prophet (Hos 1:1, 2, 4, 6, et al), sharing Paul’s presentation of divine revelation as God’s spoken word (Rom 9:6, 9, 12, 15, 17, 25). The northern kingdom of Israel is indicted because, although she experienced the benefits of God’s covenant (Hos 2:5, 9), she pursued other “lovers” as her provider. The result is the dissolution of Israel’s marriage to her God, the disavowal of the covenant bond: thus the name “Not My People, for you are not my people and I am not your ‘I am’” (Hos 1:9, NETS). Nevertheless, with language from the Abrahamic covenant evoked, hope for the nation Israel is held out: “And the number of the sons of Israel was like the sand of the sea...and it shall be, in the place where it was said to them, ‘You are not my people,’ they too shall be called, ‘sons of the living God’” (Hos 1:10, NETS). In other words, the covenant will be re-established.

Yet, Paul has surprisingly found in Hosea the prophetic vision of the Gentile inclusion in the renewal of the covenant. That Paul applies Hosea’s vision primarily to Gentiles is indicated by the fact that he specifies the application of Isaiah’s texts to Israel in Rom 9:27–29. In other words, the inclusion of the Gentiles in vv. 25–26 is matched by the promise that a

⁸⁹ Similarly, Wagner notes that Hos 1–2 “exerts a strong pull on the logic of Rom 9”; *ibid.*, 86.

remnant would be saved “on behalf of Israel” according to Isaiah in vv. 27–29.⁹⁰ Thus, an inclusio is formed from Rom 9:24–29:

A-vessels of mercy called from Jews v. 24a;

B- vessels of mercy called from Gentiles v. 24b;

B’-Hosea applied to Gentiles in vv. 25–26;

A’-Isaiah applied to Jews in vv. 27–29.⁹¹

The structure of the paragraph, then, suggests that the “children of the living God” in v. 26 are the Gentiles who previously were excluded from God’s covenant relationship as “not my people.”

With his full line of argument from Rom 9:6–29 made clear, it becomes apparent retrospectively that Paul has been operating with traditional principles of Jewish election drawn out to their logical conclusions⁹²: if God freely bestowed mercy on Israel from the beginning, God can still retain the freedom to extend mercy to both Jew and Gentile. From the choice of Isaac, Paul concluded that covenant membership is determined not merely by physical descent but by God’s promise (Rom 9:8). From the choice of Jacob, he established that election is not from works but God’s calling (Rom 9:11). From the re-establishment of Israel after the Golden Calf, he concluded that membership in God’s people is not dependent

⁹⁰ Rather than reading the Isaiah quotation in Rom 9:27–28 *only* as judgment concerning Israel, it should be read *also* as a word of hope *on behalf* (ὕπέρ) of Israel. As Hays comments: “if we remember that Paul is adducing proof-texts in support of his claim that God has called vessels of mercy from among Jews and Gentiles alike (Rom 9:24), it makes much better sense to read the Isaiah prophecy as a positive word of hope” (Hays, *Echoes*, 68). Nevertheless, the divine word does drastically reduce the number of Israel and is, therefore, also judgment; Cranfield, *Romans IX–XVI*, 471; Linebaugh, *God, Grace, and Righteousness*, 194; Wilckens, *Römer 6–11*, 198; Lohse, *Die Römer*, 276.

⁹¹ Hafemann, “The Salvation of Israel in Romans 11,” 47. In contrast, Wagner does not think the intricacies of the argument fit such a chiasmic structure. Instead, Paul takes it for granted that both Jews and Gentiles are included in Hosea’s appellations of “my people” and “loved”; *Heralds*, 86.

⁹² Campbell calls Paul’s strategy an argument of entrapment: “I suggest that the Teacher—and many other Jews at the time—would find nothing disagreeable in Paul’s argument from v. 6 through v. 24a. In fact, they would probably warmly endorse it—and this is exactly Paul’s design. If this argument is endorsed, then God *must* be allowed to include pagans in salvation in principle” *Deliverance*, 775.

on human exertion but on the merciful God (Rom 9:16). In other words, the divine promise, calling, and mercy are all creative agents in Romans 9, bringing a “non-people” into existence as God’s people.⁹³ Thus, reading Paul’s discussion with the theological dynamics of the Golden calf incident in mind, Barclay concludes:

[I]f the very existence of Israel is dependent on the creative divine mercy, it is simply an application of the same merciful creation that calls others also (the nations) into salvific existence. In other words, non-Jews...are called into being as the “people of God” by the very same means by which Israel herself was created and has been perpetually recreated.⁹⁴

Paul’s overall argument in Rom 9:6–29 has been that God’s covenant people have always been a creation of God’s freely bestowed promise, call, and mercy. Thus, Paul finds theological grounds in order to read the “not people” of Hosea’s oracle as the Gentiles who would be included in the restoration of the covenant. In other words, divine mercy has created Gentiles into “children of the living God.”⁹⁵ The point for our purposes is to see that when Paul concludes his first argument that God’s word had not failed, Gentiles are declared participants in the covenant relationship in terms of divine sonship. Paul’s jarring conclusion to the argument in Rom 9 only makes sense if the designation “children of the living God” has an agreed upon referent, namely, covenant members.

⁹³ Barclay, “I Will Have Mercy,” 98–100. God’s promise of a son to Sarah (Rom 9:8) brings about life from the deadness of the flesh (cf. Rom 4:19). God’s call of Jacob is the same divine call of “things that are not as though they are” (Rom 4:17). Barclay’s argument primarily centers on describing divine mercy as “not some preservative or restorative activity of God, but the generative divine force that brings something into existence” (100). He establishes this “creative” understanding of mercy in Rom 9 by noticing its parallel function to the divine promise and call, and by a careful comparison of Paul’s reading of divine mercy in the Golden Calf incident (Exod 32–34) with Pseudo-Philo’s reading of the same passage in *Liber Antiquitatum Biblicarum*.

⁹⁴ Barclay, “I Will Have Mercy,” 102.

⁹⁵ Sarah Whittle argues that Paul’s citation of Hosea is just the first of three covenant restoration texts from the Hebrew Bible Paul employs in Rom 9–11 including both Jews and gentiles (Rom 10:6–8 and Deut 30; Rom 11:26–27 and Isa 59:20–21; 27:9). Whittle, *Covenant Renewal and the Consecration of the Gentiles in Romans*. See especially pgs 25–27 and 31–43.

5.5 CONCLUSIONS FROM SONSHIP IN ROMANS 9

To close this chapter, I bring elements from *Jubilees*' divine sonship language into conversation with Romans. I have shown in Rom 9:4, 8, and 25 that, similarly to *Jubilees*, Paul operates with a conception of divine sonship as one designating those who are chosen for covenant membership. Israel's "adoption as son" in Rom 9:4 sits at the head of a list of privileges that are associated with the Sinai covenant. Romans 9:7–8 links the parallel categories of Israel, Abraham's seed, and the children of God. Finally, Rom 9:25 uses the covenant restoration language of Hosea ("not-my-people" become "children of the living God") to justify God's choice to have mercy on both Jews and Gentiles. What becomes apparent is how each use of divine sonship language in Rom 9 carries covenantal connotations in a similar fashion as *Jubilees*.

Paul and *Jubilees* also share the assumption that the category of "the sons of God" is functionally equivalent to the category of "Abraham's seed" (*Jub.* 2:19–20; 19:26–29; Rom 9:7–8). While both authors share this assumption, each provides different explanations as to why certain individuals within Abraham's physical lineage are chosen for covenant relationship and others are not. The biblical narrative had set the contours so that the blessing of Abraham would move through Isaac, not Ishmael, and through Jacob, not Esau. Each author, however, was free to interpret what the *implicit* rationale was that undergirded the biblical data. Paul and *Jubilees* agree that the *basis* of this election to covenant membership originates in the divine choice. For Paul, it depends on God's promise (Rom 9:7), election (Rom 9:11), and mercy (Rom 9:16). For *Jubilees*, events on earth unfold in accordance with the heavenly tablets as written by God. This does not mean their positions on election are indistinguishable. *Jubilees* interjects lengthy passages into the biblical narrative to

demonstrate Abraham's and Jacob's moral worthiness (see §3.3.2 above).⁹⁶ So, for *Jubilees*, while Abraham's moral worth was not the reason for God's choice, Abraham's character demonstrated that God chose an appropriately fitting and worthy recipient. In Paul's reading of the patriarchal narratives, Abraham's descendants are not the result of the human flesh but of divine promise (v. 8), not of human moral worth either good or bad, but of God's choice (v. 11), not human effort but God's mercy (vv. 15–16). Thus, for Paul, God has chosen Abraham without any regard for the qualities of the patriarch. John Barclay has aptly described Paul's understanding of God's choice as an *incongruent gift*, a gift given without regard to the moral fittingness of the recipient.⁹⁷ Both the author of *Jubilees* and Paul appear to be aware of similar exegetical questions that emerge from the Jewish scripture concerning divine sonship, but they provide divergent answers.

This point concerning the Abrahamic narrative would be a fascinating starting point for a conversation between Paul and the author of *Jubilees*. Because when both authors observe the absence of the law in the age of the patriarchs, one exploits the silence while the other fills in the perceived gaps of the biblical material. In other words, we might hear Paul inquire of *Jubilees*, “Why have you made such lengthy insertions about Abraham and Jacob's moral worth where the biblical text has remained silent?” As a counter, we can hear *Jubilees* question Paul, “How can you infer so strongly that God is indifferent to Isaac and Jacob's moral character from a mere omission in the biblical text? Why argue from silence?”

⁹⁶ From his comparison of Paul's reading of Abraham in Rom 4 with *Jubilees*, Watson rightly concludes that Paul's theocentric reading of the narrative results from his choice of Gen 15:6 as the hermeneutical key, while *Jubilees* anthropocentric reading of the narrative results from his choice of Gen 22:1; cf. *Jub.* 17:15–18 as the hermeneutical key; Watson, *Hermeneutics*, 158–159, 203. Similarly, John Barclay contrasts Paul's reading of scripture in Rom 9 with *Wisdom of Solomon*, finding in Paul a complete disregard for “cosmic order, rational, or natural order in the cosmos. The purposes of God are reducible to his will...”; “Unnerving Grace: Approaching Romans 9–11 from the Wisdom of Solomon,” in *Between Gospel and Election* (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2010), 108–109.

⁹⁷ Barclay, *Gift*, 531–531. In this passage, Barclay compares Rom 9 to Philo's concern to explain the rationale for God's gifts and deny that they are arbitrary or unfair. In a footnote, Barclay notes that *Jubilees* shares a similar concern (pg. 532 n. 28).

Jubilees' answer to Paul would likely be that the rewritings of Abraham's and Jacob's stories were more than merely demonstrating the patriarchs' moral worth; they were demonstrating that the patriarchs were *covenant keepers*. The determinative theological principle for *Jubilees* is the single, eternal covenant, which entails the co-existence of the covenant stipulations of the law. Therefore, if Abraham and Jacob were covenant members, the irresistible conclusion for *Jubilees* was that they were also Torah-observant. In contrast, Paul's theological reasoning starts with the Christ-event in which Christ has died for and God has justified the *ungodly* (Rom 4:5; 5:6). In the early chapters of Romans, Paul has gone to great lengths to show that there is no partiality with God between Jews and Gentiles (2:10–11) and, thus, that there is no distinction between Jews and Gentiles in the eschatological judgment (3:22–23). Yet, in Paul's thinking, this universal condemnation only served to highlight God's mercy (11:32). Thus, Rom 9 shows that when Paul rereads the Abrahamic narrative in light of the Christ-event, he finds that God had always chosen people without regard to their moral fittingness.

The structure of the list in Rom 9:4 that links *νόθεσία* to *νομοθεσία* may suggest another shared assumption between Paul and *Jubilees*. The ratification of the Sinai covenant coincides with the giving of the law. *Jubilees* rewrites the patriarchal narratives to include Mosaic laws. I have demonstrated that this tendency in *Jubilees* is a supporting motif for the larger theme of the single, eternal covenant (see §2.2.2.1 above). If the covenant and God's election of the covenant people as his sons existed at the time of creation, then the covenant stipulations in the Torah must also have existed (see especially *Jub.* 2:19–20 and §2.2.1.2).

Thus, Paul's υιοθεσία-νομοθεσία connection in Rom 9:4 suggests a shared assumption between Paul and the author of *Jubilees*, at least concerning the Sinai covenant.⁹⁸

Yet, these two shared assumptions that the sons of God are linked to Abraham's descendants and that covenant members are marked by the law serve to highlight a sharp disagreement between the two authors. Both Paul and *Jubilees*, as readers of the Jewish scripture, recognize a pressing question that emerges from the narrative of the Pentateuch: if the signature moment of Israel's covenant with God only occurred after the exodus at Sinai, then what is one to make of the patriarchs like Abraham who lived before the time of the giving of the law? Certainly, Abraham was a member of a divinely ordained covenant, but how could this be in the absence of the commandments that fundamentally marked the covenant people? *Jubilees* solves the exegetical problem by projecting the law back to creation through the existence of the heavenly tablets. Therefore, the law did exist in the patriarchal period and through divine revelation even Abraham was able to be a law-observant covenant member.

In contrast, Paul maintains the existence of multiple "covenants" and, as I argued, is able to distinguish between the Sinai covenant (i.e., the υιοθεσία-νομοθεσία type of sonship in Rom 9:4–5) and the Abrahamic descendants (i.e., the "children of God" through promise in Rom 9:7–8).⁹⁹ As Francis Watson has developed in his own comparison between Paul and *Jubilees*, Paul concludes from the belatedness of the law and circumcision that these are

⁹⁸ This conceptual parallel with *Jubilees* supports the suggestion that the pairing of υιοθεσία and νομοθεσία in Rom 9:4 by Paul is based on more than simply assonance as argued by Piper, *Justification of God*, 21.

⁹⁹ Cf. Gal 3–4 and Rom 4:11–12 where Paul makes similar arguments distinguishing the Sinai covenant members from the Abrahamic covenant members.

subordinate to the promise made to Abraham in Gen 15:6.¹⁰⁰ Thus, for *Jubilees*, the sons of God are marked out by the law at all times. In contrast, for Paul, the νόθεσία-νομοθεσία complex appears to operate only in the Sinai covenant. The more fundamental principle displayed in the Abrahamic covenant is that of divine promise.

The heart of this dialogue between Paul and the author of *Jubilees*, then, centers on the relationship between the law and covenant members: can covenant members exist without the covenant stipulations in the law? As I have argued, the burden of *Jubilees*' argument, and the function of the heavenly tablets within that argument, was to show that Israel's election, Israel's law, and, therefore, Israel's covenant with God are all eternal. Thus, the sabbath, circumcision, and the festival of weeks have all been observed in heaven long before their observance on earth. In contrast, I have argued that Paul begins to open up a distinction between the sons of God marked by the law and those marked by the promise in Rom 9. Paul supports his contention with the life of Abraham and the belatedness of circumcision, both in terms of Abraham's life (Rom 4:9–10) and in terms of Israel's national history (Gal 4:17).

There are, then, certain basic assumptions that Paul shares with the author of *Jubilees* concerning the nature of God's sons. These shared assumptions, which remain clear even in the midst of sharp theological differences between the two authors, demonstrate that Paul maintained a significant level of continuity with other early readers of the Abrahamic narrative even after his encounter with Jesus Christ. Both Paul and the author of *Jubilees* share the assumption that to be a son of God is in some way to be connected to the seed of Abraham and, thus, both authors are concerned to show some continuity between Abraham's seed and their respective communities. Moreover, both Paul and *Jubilees* are governed by the

¹⁰⁰ Watson, *Hermeneutics*, 216–218. Watson draws his conclusions primarily from Gal 3 and Rom 4 with the citations of Gen 15:6. It is also helpful to note Watson's observations on how Philo, as another Jewish interpreter, solved same problem: the law is embodied both in the universe and in the lives of holy men and women, pre-eminent among whom are the patriarchs.

scriptural narrative in which Abraham's seed moves through Isaac not Ishmael, and Jacob not Esau. This lineage is fixed by the biblical data. Each interpreter's hermeneutic, however, finds different implicit rationales for this selection of covenant members. For *Jubilees*, the covenant members display a moral worth that corresponds with their status as covenant members, though this status is not necessarily *based* on their morality. For Paul, God has chosen these individuals regardless of their moral behavior in order that Paul's argument can conclude with Jews and Gentiles included as sons of God. In other words, we can recognize significant shared assumptions between *Jubilees* and Paul in their use of divine sonship language, which in turn makes their differences of interpretation all the more sharp.

DIVINE SONSHIP IN ROMANS 8

Romans 8 is well known for its high density of references to the Spirit. Yet, Paul makes clear with these references that the work of the Spirit is to create and confirm the children of God.¹ In this chapter, I continue the argument that Paul's divine sonship language shows significant similarities to *Jubilees*' use in designating those who are elect to covenant relationship. I have demonstrated that υιοθεσία in Rom 9:4 and the other divine sonship language in that chapter can be fruitfully placed into conversation with the concept of divine sonship in *Jubilees*. This is primarily because both authors draw from the shared heritage of the Jewish scriptures and engage the same phenomenon that Abraham and the patriarchs were covenant members prior to the giving of the law. *Jubilees* argues that Israel as the sons of God participate in the single, eternal covenant, just as the patriarchs. Accordingly, there is also an eternal law encoded on the heavenly tablets, which was revealed to and observed by the patriarchs. In contrast, Paul maintains that there are multiple "covenants" and, indeed, that members of the Sinai covenant are not necessarily members of the Abrahamic covenant. In other words, Paul understands those who possessed the adoption associated with the giving of the law (i.e. the Sinai covenant) to be simultaneously in the physical family-line of the patriarchs and Christ and, yet, cut off from Christ and the seed of Abraham (i.e. the children of God through promise).

¹ The theme of divine sonship occurs seven times within Rom 8 (vv. 3, 14, 15, 16, 17, 19, 21, 23, 29), with two referring to Christ and the others to believers.

Working backwards with respect to the text of Romans, I now argue that Paul's description of the sons of God in Rom 8 has created the theological problem Paul untangles in Rom 9 because the divine sonship language in Rom 8 is best understood as a covenantal category. The sudden shift in tone from celebration at the end of Rom 8 to the deep sorrow of Rom 9 suggests, retrospectively at least, a conceptual link between the language of divine sonship in the two chapters, in particular the believer's adoption in 8:15, 23 and Israel's adoption in 9:4. Paul's change in tone, then, suggests both that Paul's divine sonship language in Rom 8 should be understood as covenant members in an analogous manner as the children of God in Rom 9.

Throughout the chapter, I highlight parallels between the theme of God's sons and supporting motifs in Romans and the same theme and motifs in *Jubilees*. I demonstrate that, similarly to *Jubilees*, Rom 8 collocates God's sons with the Spirit, renewed creation, and the Abrahamic seed. First, I demonstrate the connection between God's sons and the work of the Spirit in Rom 8:12–17. For Paul, the Spirit marks out the identity of God's sons, gives internal circumcision, and enables law fulfillment. I suggest that Paul brings these motifs together to describe the restoration of the sons of God to covenant relationship in a similar fashion as *Jubilees*. Second, in Rom 8:18–30 the sons of God are directly linked to the renewing and liberation of creation. Both Paul and *Jubilees* depict the sons' reception of life as interconnected with the renewing of creation. Yet, while *Jubilees* describes the lengthening of human *life spans*, Paul anticipates a *resurrection* for the sons of God after the pattern of the resurrection of the Son of God, Jesus Christ. Third, I argue that the sons of God in Rom 8 should also be understood as Abraham's heirs. I establish this case by identifying the inheritance of the created order shared with Christ in Rom 8 with the inheritance of the world promised to Abraham and his seed in Rom 4:13.

I conclude, then, that Paul is guided by a similar, implicit covenantal logic as found in *Jubilees* because both link the same series of motifs with divine sonship. Consequently, because Paul has described the sons of God in Rom 8 with the same series of motifs with which *Jubilees* describes the sons of God in *Jub.* 1, I suggest Paul's depiction of "adoption" marked by the Spirit in Rom 8 should be understood as the ratification of the eschatological covenant. The inauguration of the eschatological covenant by the sending of *the* Son of God and his Spirit, then, creates the impetus for Paul to explain in Rom 9 why some members of the Sinai covenant are not experiencing their hoped for eschatological fulfillment. Thus, while the "adoption" of Rom 9:4 is analogous to the "adoption" of Rom 8:15 and 23, the two are not identical. Paul conceives of the "adoption" marked by the Spirit as signifying the entrance into the eschatological covenant, what Paul calls elsewhere the "new covenant" (2 Cor 3:6).

6.1 DIVINE SONSHIP AS A LINK BETWEEN ROMANS 8 AND 9

Before I consider directly the divine sonship language in Rom 8, I briefly establish the relationship between divine sonship language in Rom 8 and 9. This is, of course, a sub-set of the question as to how Rom 9–11 fits into Romans as a whole. It is customary to cite at this point, as representative of an older scholarly trend, C. H. Dodd's view that Rom 9–11 is a "separate treatise" that "can be read quite satisfactorily without reference to the rest of the epistle."² Against Dodd, the pendulum of scholarly opinion has swung towards locating Rom 9–11 tightly within the broader argument, sometimes even as the climax.³ Some scholars

² Dodd, *The Epistle of Paul to the Romans*, 148.

³ For a survey of English language exegesis, see Reasoner, "Four Grids," 79–82. For those who closely connect Rom 9–11 to its context, Cranfield, *Romans IX–XVI*, 447; Munck, *Christ and Israel*, 28; Räisänen, "Paul, God, and Israel," 179–180. Those who see Rom 9–11 as the epistle's climax, J. C. Beker, *Paul the*

suggest that Paul's concern is that if God is found unfaithful to his promises to Israel, then the lavish promises for those "in Christ" expounded in Rom 1–8 stand on tenuous ground.⁴ In addition, scholars have noticed that at major junctures in the letter, the theme of Jewish and Gentile equality repeatedly crops up (Rom 1:16–17; 2:10; 3:9, 29–30; 4:11–12; 15:7–12) before Paul then deals with it at length in Rom 9–11.⁵ So, Rom 9–11 is rightly understood to be intimately connected to the epistle as a whole.

The particular concern of this section is to show that the divine sonship language serves as a lexical link between Rom 8 and 9: the climax of the argument of Rom 5–8 sets up Paul's anguish in Rom 9:1–5. Byrne has documented the links between the two chapters.⁶ Those in Christ have the "Spirit of adoption" (Rom 8:15) and anticipate the full adoption (Rom 8:23), while the first of Israel's privileges is adoption as son (Rom 9:4).⁷ The same Spirit of adoption from Rom 8:15 serves as Paul's witness that Israel has also received adoption as son in Rom 9:1, 4.⁸ Those in Christ are sons (Rom 8:14, 19) and children of God (8:16–17, 21), while at the same time those who constitute Israel are also designated with divine sonship language (Rom 9:7–8, 25). Finally, in both chapters the theme of divine

Apostle: The Triumph of God in Life and Thought (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1984), 87; Hays, *Echoes*, 63; Krister Stendahl, *Paul among Jews and Gentiles* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1976), 4.

⁴ Cranfield, *Romans IX–XVI*, 446–447; Franz J. Leenhardt, *The Epistle to the Romans*, trans. Harold Knight (London: Lutterworth Press, 1962), 241–242; Piper, *Justification of God*, 19.

⁵ For a discussion of the rhetorical situation surrounding these passages, Elliott, *Rhetoric*, 253.

⁶ Byrne, *Sons of God*, 127–130. Elliott, similarly, argues that the thematic unity of the argument that extends from chp. 5 through chp. 11 is the hope for the "glory of the children of God" made explicit in Rom 8:20–21; *Rhetoric*, 253–270; James D. G. Dunn, *The Theology of Paul the Apostle* (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1998), 503.

⁷ Piper adds strength to the argument linking sonship in the two chapters by noting Paul's unique religious usage of *υιοθεσία* (*Justification of God*, 32).

⁸ Elliott, *Rhetoric*, 262.

sonship is linked to God's calling (Rom 8:28, 30; 9:7, 12, 24–26), God's elective purpose (Rom 8:28; 9:11), and the ultimate goal of glory (8:18, 21; 9:23). Byrne concludes,

Chh [sic] 8 and 9 have this terminology in common because of their interdependence in content. The 'Israel' problem of Ch 9 arises immediately out of Paul's attribution of the eschatological blessings to the Christian community composed of Gentiles as well as Jews.⁹

As such, the link of divine sonship between the two chapters is a key contributor to the tension expressed in Rom 9:1–5.

Since Paul's grief and the theological problem dealt with in Rom 9 arise out of his argument from Rom 5–8, one can assume that the divine sonship described in Rom 8 has some connection to the sons of God in Rom 9, who have been shown to be those chosen for covenant relationship. Indeed, in his analysis of the rhetorical situation, Neil Elliott observes that echoes of 8:17–39 in 9:1–5 are intended to invite a Gentile-Christian audience “to share [Paul's] profound and anxious compassion *for the Jews*.”¹⁰ Beyond the rhetorical effect, Paul's defense of God's word, especially if this is the promise of descendants given to Abraham, only succeeds if one assumes a link between the conceptions of divine sonship in the two chapters. I turn now to test this assumption against the evidence in Rom 8.

6.2 GOD'S SONS AS COVENANT MEMBERS IN ROMANS 8

The divine sonship language of Roman 8 occurs in two closely linked paragraphs, vv. 12–17 and vv. 18–30. The first of these paragraphs can be roughly categorized as a description of the present status of the sons of God with a particular reference to their relation to the Spirit. The second paragraph describes the eschatological hope of the sons of God, which serves to validate Paul's statement in v. 18 that the present suffering cannot be compared to the future

⁹ Byrne, *Sons of God*, 128.

¹⁰ *Rhetoric*, 263. Emphasis original.

glory. I deal in turn with the connection to the Spirit in vv. 12–17 and with the new creation and Abraham’s inheritance in vv. 18–30.

6.2.1 DIVINE SONSHIP AND THE SPIRIT

Romans 8:12–17 introduces divine sonship language as applied to believers in conjunction with the work of the Spirit. Verses 12–14 transition from the life/death contrast in vv. 5–11 to the sons/slaves contrast in vv. 14–17, with the Spirit providing the constant strand through both paragraphs.

So then, brothers and sisters, we are debtors, not to the flesh, to live according to the flesh—for if you live according to the flesh, you will die; but if by the Spirit you put to death the deeds of the body (σώματος), you will live. For all who are led by the Spirit of God are children of God (υἱοὶ θεοῦ). For you did not receive a spirit of slavery to fall back into fear, but you have received a spirit of adoption (πνεῦμα υἱοθεσίας). When we cry, “Abba! Father!” it is that very Spirit bearing witness with our spirit that we are children of God (τέκνα θεοῦ), and if children, then heirs, heirs of God and joint heirs with Christ—if, in fact, we suffer with him so that we may also be glorified with him. (Rom 8:12–17, NRSV)

It is important to highlight that the Spirit works to ensure that the sons of God follow along a similar trajectory as *the* Son of God.¹¹ In the previous paragraph, Paul parallels the believer’s hope for a Spirit-mediated resurrection to Jesus’ resurrection through the same Spirit (v. 11). This Spirit elicits the believer’s cry toward God as “Abba,” likely echoing the church’s shared memory of Jesus’ manner of praying.¹² In v. 17, believers share in the suffering of Christ (συμπάσχομεν) in order that in the future they might share in his

¹¹ Hester, *Inheritance*, 62; Scott, *Adoption*, 244–247.

¹² The Abba-cry is likely linked to Jesus’ prayer as recorded in Mk 14:36, which is the simplest explanation why Paul would include a Greek transliteration of an Aramaic phrase subsequently translated into Greek within a letter sent to Christians in Rome (as well as churches in Galatia [Gal 4:6]). Cf. Cranfield, *Romans I–VIII*, 399–400; Jewett, *Romans*, 499; Moo, *Romans*, 502–503; Scott, *Adoption*, 182–184. Käsemann questions if the Jesus tradition is present at all, asserting instead that the cry of “Abba” should be understood as an ecstatic acclamation in response to salvation (Ernst Käsemann, *Commentary on Romans*, trans. Geoffrey W. Bromiley [London: SCM Press, 1980], 228). I do not see why, however, Käsemann’s suggestion is necessarily contradictory to the presence of the Jesus tradition.

glorification (συνδοξασθῶμεν), namely, to be coheirs with him (συγκληρονόμοι). These three verbs with the prepositional prefix “with” emphasize the sons’ shared experiences with the Son, Jesus. If believers are “super-conquerors” (v. 37), Paul is quick to add that this is only true “through him who loved us” (διὰ τοῦ ἀγαπήσαντος ἡμᾶς, cf. Gal 2:20). Finally, what has been implicit throughout Paul’s argument becomes explicit in v. 29: those predestined will also be “conformed into the image of his Son, in order that he might be the firstborn.”

Douglas Campbell has correctly summarized the work of the Spirit in Rom 8 as making sons at the behest of the Father according to the template of the Son:

What the Son has done, and where he has been, is what Christians are currently being ‘mapped onto’ by the activity of the Spirit It follows directly from this that the qualities now attributed by Paul to the Christian originate in the Son, something that should occasion little surprise given their overt semantic similarity.¹³

This “mapping” of the sons onto the pattern of the Son introduces a temporal and eschatological tension: Paul describes the sons on a certain trajectory that has not yet reached its culmination. The many sons are a step behind the Son. In the time before the sons have been conformed into the image of the Son, Paul depicts the Spirit as fulfilling two functions: 1) marking out the identity of the sons of God and 2) developing the moral character of the sons of God.

¹³ “The Story of Jesus in Romans and Galatians,” in *Narrative Dynamics in Paul: A Critical Assessment*, ed. Bruce W Longenecker (Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 2002), 106–108. Campbell’s article is primarily concerned with the narrative of Jesus as God’s Son. Campbell traces two trajectories in Jesus’ story:

Trajectory One: Descent – (1) God the Father (2) sends, delivers up, and does not spare, (3) his own (4) Son, Jesus. (5) Jesus suffers (6) and dies, (7) in an act of identification. (8) This act also atones, or (in the most general terms) deals with humanity’s problems, especially in relation to Sin. (9) This is also an act that speaks of the love of both the Father and the Son.

Trajectory Two: Ascent – (10) The Spirit of God and Christ, (11) also the Spirit of life, (12) resurrects Jesus, that is, creates new life in and for him, (13) and glorifies him (14) to the right hand of the Father, (15) from which point he reigns, (16) and also intercedes. (17) This is a glorious inheritance. (18) He cries ‘Abba, Father’. (19) As such he is ‘the firstborn’ (20) among many other ‘brothers’, (21) for whom he is also an ‘image’.

6.2.1.1 The Spirit as the Identity Marker of God's Sons in the Eschatological Era

The chief marker of the sons of God is that one is led by the Spirit of God (v. 14).¹⁴ Indeed, the Spirit is precisely the πνεῦμα υιοθεσίας, that is, the Spirit that brings about adoption (v. 15).¹⁵ This same Spirit elicits the “Abba” cry, which serves as a witness to believers¹⁶ that they are “children of God” (v. 16). Thus, for Paul, the manifestation of the Spirit serves to identify the sons of God in the present in a relatively private fashion, while the full public revelation of the sons of God still lies in the future (v. 19).

In the following, I argue that Paul's description of the present identification of the sons of God in anticipation of the full revelation of the sons of God displays similarities with the pattern found in *Jubilees*. For *Jubilees*, the identity of God's sons who are restored to covenant relationship is marked with the giving of a divine spirit, internal circumcision, and law fulfillment (cf. §2.2.1.1). Yet, even then, the identity of the sons of God will be only fully revealed in the eschaton when God's presence dwells visibly on Mt. Zion. Paul's presentation

¹⁴ Jewett notes the resumptive sense of οὗτοι giving special emphasis to the previous phrase “those led by the Spirit,” leading to the translation of “these very ones are God's sons”; *Romans*, 496.

¹⁵ Some commentators suggest that the phrase should be understood as “the Spirit who confirms adoption” rather than indicating that the Spirit is the agent of adoption because it is in fact the Father who adopts; Moo, *Romans*, 502; Murray, *Romans*, 296. This, as Moo admits, is overly subtle because the Spirit acts as the Father's agent throughout. A second view is that the Spirit anticipates a future adoption because of Rom 8:23; Barrett, *Romans*, 153; Byrne, *Sons of God*, 100; Scott, *Adoption*, 221. This view should be rejected because Paul's argument emphasizes a status believers already have as confirmed by the “Abba” cry. I take υιοθεσίας as genitive of purpose because of the parallel to the previous phrase πνεῦμα δουλείας, slightly modifying Jewett's translation of “Spirit producing sonship”; Jewett, *Romans*, 498. Cf. Cranfield, *Romans I-VIII*, 397; Fitzmyer, *Romans*, 500.

¹⁶ The dative phrase τῷ πνεύματι ἡμῶν can be taken as an indirect object (the Spirit witnesses to our spirit), or the dative can taken associatively (the Spirit witnesses *with* our spirit). The indirect object should be accepted against the associative reading cited above from the NRSV. Jewett argues for the associative view because the συμ- prefix on μαρτυρέω typically depicts co-witnessing (LSJM 1677) and because the three other terms with the συμ- prefix in 8:17 emphasize mutuality; Jewett, *Romans*, 500. Cf. Dunn, *Romans I-8*, 454; Fitzmyer, *Romans*, 501; Moo, *Romans*, 504; Murray, *Romans*, 297; Schreiner, *Romans*, 426–427. In Romans 9:1, however, συμμαρτυρούσης μοι shows that Paul can use the dative with this verb to indicate the indirect object (similarly Rom 2:15). The three συμ- terms in v. 17 apply to mutuality with Christ, so are not as strong a support for a mutual witness with the Spirit as Jewett implies. Finally, the associative view does not fit Paul's argument as well as the indirect object. For as Cranfield argues, “What standing has our spirit in this matter? Of itself it surely has no right at all to testify to our being sons of God”; Cranfield, *Romans I-VIII*, 403; Morris, *Romans*, 316–317.

of the identity of the sons of God becomes more clearly analogous to *Jubilees*’ when the motif of the Spirit is contextualized within Romans. By drawing in earlier references to the Spirit in Romans, I show that those marked out as sons of God by the Spirit are also marked out as those who have received internal circumcision and are empowered to fulfill the law through the same Spirit. More importantly, for Paul the presence of the Spirit marks a shift into a new salvation-historical era out of the old era characterized by the law. Thus, both Paul and *Jubilees* understand a shift in eras to be marked by the sons of God receiving a divine spirit, internal circumcision, and the ability to fulfill the law. All of this suggests that Paul’s thought in Rom 8 follows a covenantal pattern similar to the one found in *Jubilees*.

In Romans, Paul is not as explicit with his covenantal language as he is, for example, in 2 Cor 3, where he compares his ministry of the new covenant associated with the Spirit and life to Moses’ ministry of the old covenant associated with the letter and death. Nevertheless, we do find similar language and reasoning within Romans in reference to the Spirit, particularly in Rom 7:5–6:

While (ὅτε γὰρ) we were living in the flesh, our sinful passions, aroused by the law, were at work in our members to bear fruit for death. But now (νυνὶ δὲ) we are released from the law, dead to that which held us captive, so that we may serve in the newness of the Spirit (καινότητι πνεύματος) and not under the old written code (παλαιότητι γράμματος).

Here existence in the flesh under the old written code leading to death is contrasted with newness in the Spirit. Verse 5 describes the lives of believers “in the flesh” before being joined to Christ. The state of being “in the flesh” does not refer to human “sinful nature,”¹⁷ but, as Moo concludes, should be understood in a history of redemption context.¹⁸ The shift from one age to another can be seen in the temporal markers ὅτε ... νυνὶ δέ, emphasizing the

¹⁷ As in the NIV: “when we were controlled by the sinful nature.” See also Morris, *Romans*, 273–274.

¹⁸ Moo, *Romans*, 418. Cf. Cranfield, *Romans I–VIII*, 337; Dunn, *Romans 1–8*, 370; Jewett, *Romans*, 436–437; Stuhlmacher, *Romans*, 102.

change in epochs and the recipients' participation in that shift. Moreover, the flesh/Spirit contrast in Rom 8:9 indicates a complete transfer: believers were once "in the flesh," but are now "in the Spirit." So, in Rom 7:5–6 "in the flesh" describes the past era in the history of redemption that stands in contrast with the "newness of the Spirit." In this old era of the "flesh," Paul shockingly asserts that "sinful passions" were actually stimulated by the law (διὰ τοῦ νόμου). Further, this collusion between sin and the law ultimately produced the fruit of death. Romans 7:5, then, serves as a condensed heading for the themes of 7:7–25, where Paul is compelled to argue that the law is not sin (vv. 7–12), nor is the law death (vv. 13–20), but that somehow the law is entangled with both.

Paul can also describe this existence "in the flesh" as slavery "under the old written code" (v. 6), which should be understood as the old covenant.¹⁹ Cranfield suggests this phrase is not a simple equivalent with the law but a result of a misunderstanding or misuse of the law.²⁰ But, Paul uses the Spirit/letter contrast in two other passages, Rom 2:29 and 2 Cor 3:6, in such a way that the "letter" simply connotes an outdated stage in salvation history rather than an abuse of the law. As Moo notes, in Rom 2:29 "letter" denotes the law as a simple possession of the Jews and in no way calls into question the Jews' use of the law.²¹ In 2 Cor 3, the comparison is not between glory/no glory, but between glory and greater glory (v. 7, 8, 9, 10, 11). The "letter" had glory, but was surpassed by the glory of the new covenant of the Spirit in 2 Cor 3. In other words, the "letter" in Paul's other letter/Spirit contrasts does not describe a misuse of the law but the incomplete nature of the law before Christ. Therefore,

¹⁹ Fitzmyer, *Romans*, 460; Käsemann, *Romans*, 190–191; Moo, *Romans*, 421–422; Murray, *Romans*, 246–247; Schreiner, *Romans*, 353; Stuhlmacher, *Romans*, 102–103.

²⁰ Cranfield, *Romans I–VIII*, 339–340; Dunn, *Romans 1–8*, 373; Jewett, *Romans*, 439.

²¹ Moo, "Roman 9–11," 421 n. 68.

life “in the flesh” and “under the old written code” designates life under the old covenant era characterized by the law.

The believer has been transferred from one mode of existence in the “flesh” to the eschatological existence in the “Spirit” by means of being joined to the epoch-changing life, death, and resurrection of Jesus Christ.²² Just as Rom 7:5 introduces the themes of Rom 7:7–25, so the reference to the “newness of the Spirit” in Rom 7:6 previews the depiction of life in the Spirit in Rom 8:1–11.²³ After describing the old era of the law in 7:7–25, Paul transitions in Rom 8:1 to a description of the new era—the “now” time (νῦν)—using similar language to Rom 7:6.²⁴ Subsequently, Rom 8:5–11 unpacks how life in the flesh leads to death and, conversely, how walking in the Spirit leads to life. Romans 8:1–4 should, then, be understood as a hinge from the era of the “old written code” into the “newness of the Spirit,” which was signaled in Rom 7:5–6.

Paul draws the language of “newness” and “spirit” from Ezek 36:26–27, a covenant restoration passage in which the Spirit of God enables his covenant people to walk in the Lord’s ordinances.²⁵ John Yates specifically links Rom 8:4 to the LXX traditions of the Ezekiel passage through the shared terms δικαίωμα (“righteous requirements”), σὰρξ (“flesh”), and πνεῦμα (“Spirit”). Both passages use the image of “walking” for one’s moral

²² Verse 4: “you also died to the law through the body of Christ.” Cf. Rom 6:5–11.

²³ Romans 8:1–11 again depicts the Spirit/flesh contrast and the life/death contrast. Moreover, Paul’s allusion to Ezek 36:26–27 in Rom 7:6 anticipates the fulfillment of the requirements of the law in Rom 8:4. Cranfield, *Romans I–VIII*, 372; Stuhlmacher, *Romans*, 104; Kyle B. Wells, *Grace and Agency in Paul and Second Temple Judaism: Interpreting the Transformation of the Heart*, NovTSup 157 (Leiden: Brill, 2015), 225; Wright, “Romans,” 559–560.

²⁴ Cranfield, *Romans I–VIII*, 373; Schreiner, *Romans*, 398; Wilckens, *Römer 6–11*, 118.

²⁵ Scott, *Adoption*, 263–265; Wells, *Grace and Agency*, 260–269; John Yates, *The Spirit and Creation in Paul*, WUNT II 251 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2008), 144–145.

behavior (περιπατέω/πορεύομαι).²⁶ Thus, for Paul, the introduction of the Spirit/letter contrast marks the transition from the old covenant and the “written code” of the Mosaic law to the new (or restored) covenant of Ezek 36 and Jer 31, as he explicitly does in 2 Cor 3.²⁷

The πνεῦμα/γράμμα contrast of Rom 7:5–6 is anticipated in Paul’s discussion of the true nature of circumcision in Rom 2:25–29.²⁸ What appears to be a traditional Jewish indictment against the foolishness of Gentile idolatry in 1:18–32 gives way to an affirmation of God’s future, universal, and impartial judgment in 2:1–16. The hard edge of Paul’s polemic suddenly emerges clearly in 2:17–24 when those who are called Jews and possess the law yet do not live in accordance with the law are called to account. Romans 2:25–29 further narrows the argument to a consideration of circumcision. Verse 25 appears to be a relatively uncontroversial premise in Paul’s argument, at least one for which he does not feel obligated to argue: circumcision is only profitable for one who practices the law, otherwise physical circumcision is equivalent to uncircumcision. In contrast, Paul’s inferences in vv. 26–27 are more contentious statements that require further defense. Paul claims that uncircumcised law-keepers will be reckoned (λογισθήσεται) as circumcised and will judge those who possess the written code and yet are law-breakers. Verses 28–29 serve to add initial support (γάρ) for vv. 26–27 with the distinction between “Jewishness” and circumcision that is visible (ἐν τῷ φανερόῳ) from that which is hidden (ἐν τῷ κρυπτῷ). Paul anchors his contrast between the visible and hidden in the concept of a “circumcision of the heart performed by the Spirit and not by the letter” (περιτομή καρδίας ἐν πνεύματι οὐ γράμματι). Here Paul is working with the distinction between internal over against external

²⁶ Yates, *The Spirit and Creation in Paul*, 144.

²⁷ For a similar development, see Gordon D. Fee, *God’s Empowering Presence: The Holy Spirit in the Letters of Paul* (Peabody, Mass: Hendrickson Publishers, 1994), 520.

²⁸ For a comparison of the texts drawing out the similarities, see Wells, *Grace and Agency*, 224–225.

circumcision as drawn from Deut 10:16; 30:6 in order to establish the nature of authentic circumcision.²⁹ Again, Paul's Spirit/letter contrast depicts the difference between the old covenant of the letter and the new covenant of the Spirit.³⁰

Thus, the Spirit that creates and marks out the sons of God after the pattern of the Son of God in Rom 8 is the very same Spirit whose presence characterizes life in the new covenant reality for Paul. Moreover, those who will enjoy this new age of the Spirit will be marked by internal, hidden circumcision. In describing new covenant members as sons of God marked by the divine Spirit and internal circumcision, Paul is working with the same images and logic of the covenant restoration found in *Jub.* 1:22–25. There, when Israel returns to the Lord, he promises to “cut away the foreskins of their minds” and “create a holy spirit for them.” These will be designated “sons of the living God” and every angel and spirit will know them. Just as *Jubilees* links internal circumcision and the giving of a divine spirit with the restoration of God's children to covenant relationship, so Paul links the same motifs in Romans. Moreover, both authors understand the identity of the sons of God as needing to be authenticated, likely because the present circumstances of each respective community might suggest otherwise. To be sure, Paul moves the work of the Spirit to the fore in a manner unprecedented in *Jubilees*. Nevertheless, these are clear indicators that Paul's thought reflects a covenantal pattern that is analogous to the one observed in *Jubilees*.

²⁹ This notion of the circumcision of the heart could recall a set of related passages (e.g. Deut 10:4; 30:6; Jer 4:4; 9:25); however, Wells argues that Deut 30:6 is the primary referent based on 1) closer common vocabulary and 2) the additional common elements of κρυπτά/φανερὰ (LXX Deut 29:28), 3) exhortations φθλάσσεσθαι ... τὰ δικαιώματα αὐτοῦ, as well as 4) the shared polemic against Jewish presumption based on possession of the law (LXX Deut 29:18); *ibid.*, 209–210. Cf. Fee, *God's Empowering Presence*, 489–493.

³⁰ Ernst Käsemann, *Perspectives on Paul*, trans. Margaret Kohl, The New Testament Library (London: S.C.M. Press, 1971), 143; Moo, *Romans*, 174–175; Schreiner, *Romans*, 142–143; Wells, *Grace and Agency*, 221–225; Wright, “Romans,” 449.

6.2.1.2 God's Sons, the Spirit, and the Law in Rom 8:2

In the previous section, I explored the wider context of the Spirit/letter contrast in Romans, which locates the sons of God within a new covenant context. In this section, I look at the more immediate context, which situates the sons of God and the Spirit in an ethical discussion. Paul's contrast between slaves and God's sons in Rom 8:15 began as a contrast between the Spirit/flesh and life/death in vv. 5–11. Those who live according to the flesh have the mindset of the flesh (v. 5), which leads to death because the flesh can neither submit to God's law (v. 7) nor please God (v. 8). Paul does not complete the contrast by writing that those who have the mindset of the Spirit submit to God's law and please God, though this appears to be implied. This inference is supported by the previous verse, Rom 8:4, where those who walk according to the Spirit fulfill the righteous requirement of the law (τὸ δίκαιωμα τοῦ νόμου πληρωθῆ). Thus, the flow of Paul's argument in Rom 8 indicates that those who walk according to the Spirit, that is, the sons of God, fulfill the requirement of the law.

Interpretations of this “fulfillment of the law” generally break down into two options: forensic or transformative. The forensic view holds that Paul is thinking here of the actions of Christ on behalf of believers rather than the obedience of believers themselves.³¹ The transformative view understands this law fulfillment to be associated with the actual obedience of believers.³² The transformative view should be accepted. First, while it is true that the passive verb “might be fulfilled” (πληρωθῆ) indicates divine activity, the active

³¹ Dunn, *Romans 1-8*, 423–435; Fitzmyer, *Romans*, 487–488; Käsemann, *Romans*, 217–219; Moo, *Romans*, 482–484. Moo, in particular, points to the passive verb “might be fulfilled” and to the fact that the “always imperfect obedience of the law by Christians” does not answer the “inability of the law” in v. 3. The passive verb does indicate divine activity, but this does not negate human agency because the biblical connotations of the verb “walk” indicate behavior (see note 37 below). Second, the perfect obedience of the law is not necessarily the contrast to the “inability of the law,” especially in light of the ethical discussion in vv. 5–8.

³² Cranfield, *Romans I-VIII*, 384; Jewett, *Romans*, 485–486; Schreiner, *Romans*, 405–406; Wells, *Grace and Agency*, 265–266.

participle “those who walk” (περιπατοῦσιν) indicates human ethical participation.³³ Second, the surrounding context supports actual human obedience.³⁴ Romans 7:14–25 describes actual bondage to sin, and Rom 8:5–11 describes those in the flesh as not being able to submit to God’s law or to please God. This context supports understanding the fulfillment of the law in Rom 8:4 as also entailing human action. The fulfillment of the righteous requirement of the law, then, is human obedience through the empowering of the divinely given Spirit.

God’s actions described in the first part of the paragraph, however, enable the believer’s participation in fulfilling the requirement of the law.³⁵ In verse 3, Paul contrasts what the law was not able to do with what God accomplished through the sending of his Son, namely the condemnation (κατέκρινεν) of sin. The law was weakened because³⁶ of human flesh, essentially summarizing the plight described in Rom 7:13–25.³⁷ Thus, the law was not able to produce its goal of life (Rom 7:10). In contrast, God was able to condemn sin by means³⁸ of sending his Son. God’s ability to do what the law could not in v. 3 serves as the explanation of v. 2,³⁹ where believers are described as being liberated *from* the law of sin and death *by* the law of the Spirit of life. I have argued that Rom 8:1–4 serves as a transition from the era of the “old written code” characterized by sin and death into the new era of the

³³ See Wells’ helpful discussion on the dialectic between divine initiative and human agency in this passage; Wells, *Grace and Agency*, 266.

³⁴ Schreiner, *Romans*, 406.

³⁵ Paul links v. 4 to vv. 1–3 with ἵνα.

³⁶ The ἐν ᾧ in v. 3 should be taken as causal. Cranfield, *Romans I–VIII*, 379; Fitzmyer, *Romans*, 484; Schreiner, *Romans*, 401.

³⁷ I discuss the relevant exegetical details of the text below.

³⁸ The participle πέμψας is modal.

³⁹ Verse 3 links to v. 2 with γάρ.

“newness of the Spirit” characterized by righteousness and life. In the following argument, I suggest a similar understanding of Rom 8:2.

Here in Rom 8:2 we have entered into one of the more contentious verses for Paul’s understanding of the law in Romans.⁴⁰ The chief exegetical point concerns the two contrasting uses of νόμος in Rom 8:2:

For the law of the Spirit of life (ὁ γὰρ νόμος τοῦ πνεύματος τῆς ζωῆς) in Christ Jesus has liberated you from the law of sin and death (τοῦ νόμου τῆς ἁμαρτίας καὶ τοῦ θανάτου).

The first νόμος serves as the grammatical subject that brings about the liberation of believers from the second νόμος. There is a significant amount of debate concerning the identity of these two “laws” and their relation to each other. Are they the same law or two different entities? If they are one, how can one be liberated by the same entity that formerly held the person captive? If they are two, why does Paul use νόμος to describe both? Moreover, is there sufficient evidence to support the contention that Paul changes the referent of νόμος in such a short space?

While scholarly answers vary, the suggestions from 1) Douglas Moo, 2) Heikki Räisänen, and 3) Hans Hübner serve to establish the three main categories:

1) Each instance of νόμος should be taken metaphorically so that “the real contrast is then between the Spirit on the one hand and sin and death on the other.”⁴¹

⁴⁰ The interpretive problems with Paul’s view of the law are numerous. Many arise from attempts to synthesize the Apostle’s view from the polemical situations addressed in the letters to the Romans, Galatians, Corinthians, and so forth. Representative scholars along the range of conclusions are Heikki Räisänen, who finds contradiction within Paul’s view of the law (*Paul and the Law* [Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1986]), Hans Hübner, who finds development in it (*Law in Paul’s Thought*, trans. J.C.G. Greig [Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1984]), and Frank Thielman, who finds a genuine synthesis (*Paul and the Law: A Contextual Approach* [Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity Press, 1994]). For my part, the following discussion will be limited to the way in which the law relates to heavenly revelations within the story of God’s sons as narrated by the respective authors of *Jubilees* and Romans.

⁴¹ Moo, *Romans*, 473–477. The quotation is taken from pg. 476. Cf. Fitzmyer, *Romans*, 482–483; Käsemann, *Romans*, 215–216; Leander E. Keck, *Romans* (Nashville, TN: Abingdon Press, 2005), 197; Murray, *Romans*, 276.

2) The terms are used in two different senses with the “law of the Spirit of life” used metaphorically in order to create a wordplay with the “law of sin and death,” which refers to the Torah.⁴²

3) Both occurrences of νόμος refer to the Torah.⁴³

In the following, I defend the third view. Before I address the arguments of each position, it is helpful to acknowledge certain points of agreement. Even interpreters who do not read Paul’s uses of νόμος as literal references to the Torah in Rom 8:2 nevertheless think that Paul uses the term to evoke Torah, either in order to set up a comparison between Torah and the Spirit or as a polemical swipe against Torah.⁴⁴ Second, it is generally acknowledged that Paul’s most predominate use of νόμος is as a reference to Torah, again including scholars who do not read Rom 8:2 as such.⁴⁵ A general pattern, then, emerges for those who believe Paul’s use of νόμος in Rom 8:2, particularly the “law of the Spirit of life,” does not refer to Torah. First, scholars appeal to the lexical range of meaning for νόμος, including more general meanings like “principle” or “standard,” based on the evidence from broader

⁴² Räisänen, *Paul and the Law*, 52; Fee, *God’s Empowering Presence*, 521–525.

⁴³ Hübner, *Law in Paul’s Thought*, 144–146. Hübner views the two laws of Rom 8:2 as the same law with distinct genitival clauses that define “the perspective of the moment from which it is regarded.” Because he found this to be the case in Rom 3:27–28 with the law viewed either from the perspective of works or faith, he suggests one might suppose this to be the case for Rom 8:2. Hübner adds further support by noting the link between “the law of the Spirit of life” and Rom 7:10, 14. The law, clearly the Mosaic law here, is said to be “spiritual” (πνευματικός) and by its nature intends to give life (7:10), but this nature and purpose were thwarted by sin-indwelt-flesh. In Rom 7:23, however, Hübner vacillates on the nature of the νόμος as a distorted Torah, but he does not think this should change the understanding of 8:2. Rather, it should only serve to intensify the extent to which Paul thinks the Torah can be perverted. For similar views, see Dunn, *Romans 1-8*, 416–418; Jewett, *Romans*, 481; Klyne Snodgrass, “Spheres of Influence: A Possible Solution to the Problem of Paul and the Law,” *JSNT* 32 (1988): 99; Wilckens, *Römer 6-11*, 122–123; Wright, *The Climax of the Covenant*, 193–216.

⁴⁴ For example, Räisänen says, “Paul intentionally plays with words. Although νόμος does not mean Torah, the word has not been chosen without reference to it”; Heikki Räisänen, *Jesus, Paul and Torah: Collected Essays*, trans. David E. Orton (Sheffield: JSOT, 1992), 91. Similarly, Moo states that the “‘nomos of the Spirit’ cannot, then, refer to the Mosaic law. It may, however, allude to the ‘law written on the heart’ (cf. Jer. 31:31–34), the ‘law’ of the New Covenant”; Moo, *Romans*, 475.

⁴⁵ E.g. Moo, *Romans*, 474.

literature.⁴⁶ In this regard, Paul's usage of νόμος in Rom 7:21–25 that arguably varies in meaning becomes significant. Second, these interpreters attempt to show how Paul's use of νόμος in Rom 8:2 cannot refer to Torah in the context, so that with this option eliminated one must settle for a more general sense that nevertheless still evokes Torah.⁴⁷

Scholars advocating a more figurative meaning of νόμος have fallen short of establishing the lexically *possible* use of “principle” as the most *probable* meaning in the context. In the following, I briefly consider the “law of sin and death,” arguing that it should be understood as the Mosaic law. Next, I consider the more contentious reading of the “law of the Spirit of life” as a reference to the Torah, examining arguments against the reading before building a positive case. The broader contextual clues support reading both uses of νόμος in Rom 8:2 as Torah despite the grammatical and theological complexity entailed in such a reading. Finally, I support this reading of νόμος in Rom 8:2 by comparing the role of the Torah with respect to the sons of God as found in *Jubilees*. Both authors acknowledge some deficiency in the Torah that God rectifies in order for the sons of God to fulfill the law.

The law from which believers are liberated is termed the “law of sin and death.” The previous discussion in Rom 7:7–25 attempts to show that Torah, though utterly entangled with sin (v. 7) and death (v. 13), should not be equated with either. From this context, Moo concludes that understanding “the law of sin and death” as the Mosaic law links sin and death to Torah in a way Paul just argued against, so the scale is tipped in favor of reading the term as “principle.”⁴⁸ Moo's reading, however, misunderstands the burden of Paul's argument in Rom 7. The reason Paul must expend such energy distinguishing the law from sin is because

⁴⁶ This contention is often linked to an essay written by Heikki Räisänen entitled “Paul's Wordplay on νόμος” found in *Jesus, Paul and Torah*.

⁴⁷ E.g. Moo, *Romans*, 474.

⁴⁸ Moo, *Romans*, 364. Cf. also Cranfield, *Romans I-VIII*, 364, 376.

he understands the holy, spiritual, and good Mosaic law to be deeply entangled with sin and death. Sinful passions were aroused by the Mosaic law (v. 5). Paul describes sin as using the Mosaic law as “an opportunity” (ἀφορμὴν) to produce more covetousness (v. 8) and eventually to kill the “I”⁴⁹ (v. 11). Throughout Rom 7, Paul has described the tension between the Torah as God’s holy law and as unwilling accomplice commandeered by sin. If Rom 7:7–25 has describes the link—as well as distinction—between the actual Torah, sin, and death, then reading “law of sin and death” in Rom 8:2 as a reference to the Torah before the Spirit is warranted.⁵⁰ Verse 3, which serves as an explanation of v. 2 (γάρ), also supports this reading because it describes the weakness of the law as being the “flesh,” the very same weakness of the Mosaic law in Rom 7:18 and 25. In addition, even with Paul’s care to distinguish Torah from sin in Rom 7, he unabashedly associates Torah with sin and death throughout the corpus (e.g. Gal 3:19; 1 Cor 15:56; Rom 5:20). N.T. Wright is correct, then, to understand the “law of sin and death” as a shorthand reference to the Torah as commandeered

⁴⁹ Throughout this section, I refer to the heavily debated ἐγώ of Rom 7 simply as “I.” The debate concerning the identity of the ἐγώ in Rom 7 is well known. For a defense that the “I” is a person under the “old written code,” the position I assume here, see Moo, *Romans*, 441–451. Moo argues the “I” is an unregenerate person. The most significant arguments are 1) the strong connection of the ἐγώ with flesh (vv. 14, 18, 25); 2) throughout the ἐγώ struggles without the aid of the Spirit (“I myself” in v. 25); 3) the ἐγώ is “under the power of sin,” from which according to 6:2, 6, 11, 18–22 the baptized believer has been released; 4) the ἐγώ is a prisoner of the law of sin (v. 23), from which according to 8:2 the believer has been released; 5) the structural marker of 7:4–6 places Rom 7 under the old covenant of death and not under the new covenant of the Spirit. For a defense of the “I” in vv. 7–13 as representative of humanity in general, both under the law and not, while vv. 14–25 depict a mature, Spirit-led Christ, see Cranfield, *Romans I–VIII*, 340–347. Evidence in support of this view includes 1) the shift from past tense verbs in vv. 7–13 to present tense in vv. 14–25; 2) the Adamic elements present in vv. 7–13; 3) the unlikelihood that the present tense verb would be used in such a sustained fashion to depict the vividness of the situation in vv. 14–25; 4) v. 24 would be melodramatic if it were not a cry of Paul’s actual present distress; 5) the order of vv. 24–25, the final state of the delivered person (v. 25b), is the exact situation described in vv. 14–23. For the view that Paul is emphasizing the “not-yet” aspect of Christian salvation in 7:7–25 (or 7:14–25) after already emphasizing the decisive “already” in 7:4–6, see Dunn, *The Theology of Paul the Apostle*, 472–477. Dunn recognizes that the differing interpretations all stand on the common ground that vv. 7–25 describe humankind under the power of sin. The strength of Dunn’s position is his acknowledgement of the “not yet” within the present age under the power of sin and death. In response to the historic question of Paul’s use of present tense verbs in vv. 13–25, I read these as historic presents used to vividly describe Saul the Pharisee’s experience before Christ as well as any Torah-observant Jew’s present experience under what Paul terms “the letter” rather than “the Spirit.”

⁵⁰ Byrne, *Sons of God*, 92; Dunn, *Romans 1–8*, 416–417; Schreiner, *Romans*, 400; Snodgrass, “Influence,” 99; Wilckens, *Römer 6–11*, 122–123.

by sin, which Paul can use without fear of confusion *because* he has so carefully nuanced his view of Torah, sin, and death in Rom 7.⁵¹

The more contentious claim is that the “law of the Spirit of life” is also a reference to the Torah. If one grants that the “law of sin and death” refers to the Mosaic law, then there are three arguments against also reading the “law of the Spirit of life” as the Torah. First, Paul appears to use the term νόμος in different senses in the short span of Rom 7:21–25. It is then claimed that Paul follows a similar pattern in Rom 8:2 by using νόμος to refer to Torah in one phrase (law of sin and death) and then to refer to a “principle” or “idea” in the second phrase (law of the Spirit of life).⁵² Second, if both “laws” refer to the Mosaic law, is it possible to make sense out of the claim that the law of Moses liberates humans from the law of Moses?⁵³ Third, understanding Torah as a liberating agent contradicts Paul’s oft-repeated view of Torah as opposed to the Spirit, righteousness, and life because righteousness has come “apart from the law” (e.g. Rom 3:21).⁵⁴ I examine the νόμος references in Rom 7:21–25 first before considering the final two objections together.

⁵¹ Wright, *The Climax of the Covenant*, 210.

⁵² Räisänen, *Paul and the Law*, 52. Within Räisänen’s broader thesis demonstrating contradiction within Paul’s theology of the law, 8:2 represents one passage in which Paul speaks of the abolition of the Torah. In further support of two senses of νόμος in the verse, Räisänen points to the previous context of 7:21–25, suggesting that Paul used νόμος in 3 or 4 different senses there. One should not be surprised, then, to find multiple senses of the term even in the same sentence here. Similarly to Räisänen, despite his overall thesis suggesting a coherent synthesis of Paul’s view of the law, see Thielman, *Paul and the Law*, 201. Thielman argues there are two separate laws: the “law of the Spirit of life in Christ Jesus” is a reference to Christ’s death and resurrection while the “law of sin and death” is the Mosaic law with its tendency to stimulate sinful passions (cf. 7:5).

⁵³ Räisänen, *Paul and the Law*, 52; *Jesus, Paul and Torah*, 63–68; Thielman, *Paul and the Law*, 201 esp. n. 28.

⁵⁴ Moo, *Romans*, 474–475.

If Paul uses νόμος in a metaphorical sense alongside a literal sense in Rom 7:21–25, then the likelihood that he does so in Rom 8:2 increases.⁵⁵ There are seven uses of νόμος in the five verses:

So I find it to be a law (εὐρίσκω ἄρα τὸν νόμον) that when I want to do the good, evil lies close at hand. For I delight in the law of God (τῷ νόμῳ τοῦ θεοῦ) in my inmost self, but I see in my members another law (ἕτερον νόμον) at war with the law of my mind (τῷ νόμῳ τοῦ νοός μου) making me captive to the law of sin (τῷ νόμῳ τῆς ἁμαρτίας) that dwells in my members...So then, with my mind I am a slave to the law of God (νόμῳ θεοῦ), but with my flesh I am a slave to the law of sin (νόμῳ ἁμαρτίας). (Rom 7:21–23, 25 NRSV)

The references to the “law of God” in vv. 22 and 25 are clearly literal references to the Torah. The “law of my mind” in v. 23 should also be equated to the “law of God” (vv. 22, 25), and is thus a reference to the Torah. This is because of the conceptual overlap between “the mind” and the “inmost self,” that is, the faculty with which the “I” delights in the law of God in v. 22. Moreover, it is with the “mind” that the “I” is a slave of the “law of God” in v. 25.⁵⁶ Thus, the “law of the mind” should be equated with the “law of God,” namely, the Mosaic law.

The “law of sin” in Rom 7:23 and 25 might be read as distinct from the Mosaic law because Paul has just argued that the Torah is not sin (v. 7), but rather the Torah is holy (v. 12), spiritual (v. 14), and good (v. 16).⁵⁷ But similar arguments concerning the “law of sin and death” in Rom 8:2 can be raised in support of the “law of sin” in Rom 7:23 and 25 as the Torah. The reason why Paul must dedicate such energy to nuance his view of Torah is because the Mosaic law was used by sin to produce more sin (v. 8) and finally death (v. 11). The “law of sin” should be understood as the Torah under the power of sin. As Thomas

⁵⁵ E.g. Murray, *Romans*, 276. For that matter, most interpreters also link in 3:27 and 9:30–31. It seems to me, however, that the debates on “law” in these passages are settled by how one takes the more extensive passages in Rom 7 and 8. For this reason, and for the interests of space, I will only take up uses of “law” in Rom 7 and 8.

⁵⁶ Fitzmyer, *Romans*, 476; Schreiner, *Romans*, 376.

⁵⁷ Moo, *Romans*, 464.

Schreiner concludes, the “phrase ‘law of sin,’ then is no criticism of the law per se; rather, sin is so powerful and wicked that it can use the good law of God for its malicious purposes.”⁵⁸

In contrast, Paul does appear to use νόμος in a metaphorical sense in Rom 7:21: εὐρίσκω ἄρα τὸν νόμον, τῷ θέλοντι ἐμοὶ ποιεῖν τὸ καλόν, ὅτι ἐμοὶ τὸ κακὸν παράκειται. Although some who maintain a literal reference to Torah even here argue that νόμον should be taken as an accusative of reference,⁵⁹ the most natural reading would be to take the accusative as the direct object: “So, I discover the law, namely, that when I want to do good, evil is present with me.” If νόμον is the direct object of Paul’s discovery, one must surely interpret the term with the more general “principle” rather than a reference to the Mosaic law.⁶⁰ Reading v. 21 in this way is also supported by v. 23, where the “I” sees “another law” (ἕτερον νόμον), which is contrasted with the “law of my mind.”⁶¹ The wording of “another law” demands a distinction from “the law of my mind,” which I argued above is the Mosaic law. So, Paul appears to conceive of this “other law” as distinct from the Torah. Schreiner argues that this “other law” refers to the Mosaic law’s alliance with sin, and therefore is equivalent to the “law of sin” (vv. 23, 25). But the wording of v. 23 suggests a distinction even between the “other law” and the “law of sin.” The “other law” is a third entity that

⁵⁸ Schreiner, *Romans*, 376.

⁵⁹ The rendering would then be “I find with reference to the law.” Schreiner, *Romans*, 376–3778; Wright, *The Climax of the Covenant*, 198. Jewett attempts to maintain a literal reference to the Torah in a different fashion by separating τὸν νόμον from the verb immediately preceding (εὐρίσκω) so that “the law” is the object of τῷ θέλοντι; *Romans*, 469 (citing H. A. W. Meyer). Thus, “my will is directed to the law.” This seems to strain the syntax compared to taking τὸν νόμον as the object of εὐρίσκω.

⁶⁰ Cranfield, *Romans I–VIII*, 362; Fee, *God’s Empowering Presence*, 512 n. 118; Fitzmyer, *Romans*, 475–476.

⁶¹ Paul’s use of “ἕτερον” would then mean not “another of the same kind,” but “a different thing,” as in his other uses of the term for different glories (1 Cor 15:40), different spirits (2 Cor 11:4), or different gospels (2 Cor 11:4; Gal 1:6). Cf. BAGD, 315.

wages war against the “law of my mind” (the Torah) and places the “I” in captivity to the “law of sin” (the sin-Torah alliance).

What, then, is this “other law,” which the “I” has discovered? It is the principle that even if one desires to do good and delights in the Mosaic law, evil is still present. In other words, the νόμος that Paul finds in v. 21 is a recapitulation of the description of indwelling sin in vv. 14–20. In my interpretation of vv. 21–25, the Mosaic law, which is the law of God that the “I” delights in, can also be identified as the “law of sin” when sin commandeers it. In contrast, the law discovered by Paul, the “other law,” is the principle of indwelling sin.

Paul, then, does employ a play-on-words with νόμος in Rom 7:21–25 so that at least two uses of νόμος should be understood as “principle.” But this conclusion does not immediately require one to see the same wordplay in Rom 8:2. Indeed, there is reason to think at the very least the wordplay has changed. In Rom 8:2, Räisänen reads the negative use of νόμος (“law of sin and death”) as a literal reference to Torah, but the positive use (“law of the Spirit of life”) as metaphorical. The wordplay found in Rom 7:21–25 develops differently. The literal references to Torah are positive statements (“I delight in the law of God,” “the law of my mind,” “I serve the law of God with my mind”), and the figurative uses of νόμος are presented in a negative light (“I find the law that when I want to do good, evil is present,” “I see a different law waging war”). Thus, the play-on-words with νόμος in Rom 7:21–25 actually appears to support reading “law of the Spirit of life” as a reference to Torah.

I return now to the second and third objections against understanding the “law of the Spirit of life” as Torah: Can the Torah liberate one from the Torah? And, does the Torah as a liberating agent contradict Paul’s contrast between law, sin, and death versus Spirit, righteousness, life? These objections can be answered when one understands the sending of the Son (v. 3) as an epoch changing event. In this way, the genitival phrases modifying each

νόμος are neither indicating two different entities (as for Räisänen) nor one's subjective perspective on the law.⁶² Instead, what is in view is the Torah in different stages of salvation history, one before the sending of the Son and Spirit in contrast with one after. Here Klyne Snodgrass' suggestion of situating Paul's view of the law within his theology of participation in Christ is helpful.⁶³ Paul's description of Torah will differ if it is under the tyranny of sin or in Christ:

[I]n Paul the law does not stand for itself; it occurs in a context and in connection with something else. It refers to the law as *used* in various specific ways. The qualitative genitive forms express not the nature of the law, but the context in which the law works.⁶⁴

Reading v. 2 as Torah in two different stages of history removes any sense of contradiction with v. 3, because the sending of the Son is precisely the remedy for the root cause of the weakness of the law (v. 3)—namely, the flesh. This rectification of the law, in turn, serves as the basis (γάρ) for the statement that the Torah in one state can liberate from the same Torah in a different state (v. 2). In this sense, Frank Thielman is correct to *link* the “law of the Spirit of life” to the death and resurrection of Christ that established the new covenant.⁶⁵ Thielman goes too far, however, by *equating* the Christ event with the “law of the Spirit of life.” This seems to skip a step in Paul's logic. The Christ event remedies the weakness of the law—i.e., the sin-indwelt-flesh—so that the νόμος as applied in the realm of Christ can bring about freedom from the νόμος as it is applied in the realm of sin and death.

The positive case for reading the “law of the Spirit of life” as a reference to the Torah is further supported by key pieces of evidence in Rom 7. First, Torah was intended to bring

⁶² As Räisänen objects against Hübner; *Paul and the Law*, 52.

⁶³ Snodgrass, “Influence,” 98–100.

⁶⁴ Snodgrass, “Influence,” 99. Italics original.

⁶⁵ Thielman, *Paul and the Law*, 201.

life (ἡ ἐντολὴ ἡ εἰς ζωὴν, Rom 7:10). This intention of giving life is what the Torah was not able to do because it was weakened by the flesh (Rom 8:3). Second, Torah is πνευματικός (Rom 7:14). This term, as elsewhere in the Pauline corpus, signifies that which belongs to or pertains to the Holy Spirit.⁶⁶ As noted earlier, Torah's goal of giving life was frustrated in the earlier age, and the reason can now be seen by Paul in retrospect: Torah only gives life when accompanied by the Spirit. As Wright concludes on the positive connection between the Spirit and Torah in the passage, "having asserted bluntly in 7.14 that the Torah is πνευματικός, he is now [in Rom 8:1–11] showing that the people created in Christ is a people who, as it were, fit the law (or perhaps, a people whom the law fits)."⁶⁷ Because the Mosaic Torah is associated both with life and the Spirit, the previous context of Rom 7 supports reading the "law of the Spirit of life" as Torah. Finally, reading the "law of the Spirit of life" as a reference to the Torah in Rom 8:2 fits the verse satisfyingly into the flow of thought within the paragraph. The righteous requirement of the law is fulfilled in those who walk κατὰ πνεῦμα (v. 4), and this in turn leads to life (vv. 5ff.).⁶⁸

To conclude my evaluation of the intricate debate concerning νόμος in Rom 8:2, one should understand both instances as Torah. In this way Rom 8:2 serves as the appropriate

⁶⁶ On πνευματικός within the Pauline corpus, see especially 1 Cor 2:13; 12:1. Fee argues that the adjective here as elsewhere only means pertaining to or belonging to the Spirit. *God's Empowering Presence*, 510.

⁶⁷ Wright, *The Climax of the Covenant*, 204.

⁶⁸ Räisänen's reading of the passage in *Jesus, Paul and Torah*, 66–68 is a helpful point of contrast. Räisänen concedes that the law is indeed viewed in a different light in 8:4 in comparison with Rom 7:1–8:3. Nevertheless, for Räisänen, this should not be an argument for a literal interpretation of νόμος as Torah in 8:2. Räisänen insists that Paul has not described a change in Torah but a change in the position of the person. Torah's role is subordinate in the overall drama. For Räisänen, a shift occurs at 8:4 in which the will of God is still revealed in the demands of the law: "The passage is not pointed in this direction, however, until 8.4. If this sentence were absent, one would be quite justified in taking 6.14 and 7.1–6 as a basis for interpreting 7.7–8.3: what is described is the situation under the law, from which one has been freed" (67). The sentence is *not* absent, however. One is justified in being suspicious of special pleading when he concludes, "This theology is multilayered and full of tension; it is not at all uncommon for statements constructed from quite different points of view to follow one another. Verse 4 offers no basis for a literal interpretation of v. 2." The sounder exegetical move would be to allow the conclusion of the paragraph to inform the perplexing statement of 8:2.

vindication of Torah that Paul set out to establish in Rom 7:7ff. Romans 7:5–6 previews the shift in ages, with Rom 7:7–25 explaining why Torah was so closely associated with sin and death in the age of the “letter,” while Rom 8:1–11 describes how Torah can be characterized as the Torah of the Spirit of Life in Christ Jesus.⁶⁹

Thus far I have been following the line of Hübner, Dunn, Jewett, Wright, and others on Rom 8:2. Bringing *Jubilees* into the discussion at this point, however, sheds light on the debate by demonstrating how another Second Temple text depicted the role of Torah in the restoration of the sons of God to the covenant. I have argued that Paul views the shift from the era of the “letter” into the era of the “Spirit” as coordinated with God’s overcoming the deficiency of Torah by sending the Son and Spirit. In other words, a divine intervention rectified a deficiency in Torah so that God’s sons could fulfill its righteous requirements and experience the renewed covenant marked by the Spirit. I have shown a similar pattern in *Jubilees*.

Setting out a summary of my findings from *Jubilees* pertaining to the Mosaic law and the heavenly tablets helps to connect *Jubilees* and Romans and, subsequently, to contrast their conclusions. The exile proved that the Sinai covenant had been broken. The necessary corollary to the fact of a broken Sinai covenant was that the Mosaic law, as the binding agreement of the covenant, was in some sense deficient. The author of *Jubilees* arguably understood this deficiency in the Mosaic law to be that it represented an *incomplete* revelation of the heavenly tablets. This can be seen within the narrative of *Jubilees*. As was

⁶⁹ To be clear, I do not think this speaks to the question of Torah’s enduring status within Pauline churches. That question is more appropriately settled in connection with Rom 10:4 (τέλος γὰρ νόμου Χριστός) and the associated race imagery. See Robert Badenas, *Christ: The End of the Law: Romans 10.4 in Pauline Perspective*, JSNT 10 (Sheffield: JSOT, 1985), 104–107. The race has reached its goal, which in some sense subsequently becomes obsolete. Thus, Paul can say the things he does about circumcision (1 Cor 7:19), observing days (Rom 14:5–6), and purity/impurity regulations (Rom 14:14). This is not the place to discuss how Paul arrived at these decision, but only to recognize something drastic has occurred to Torah.

discussed in §3.1.1, the sons of God as covenant members were the tradents of a written tradition. Key patriarchal figures such as Enoch, Noah, Abraham, Jacob, and Levi were the recipients of special revelations of material from the heavenly tablets and conveyed through angelic mediators long before the time of Moses. Moreover, *Jubilees* itself stands as the second Torah, the “law and the testimony,” that Moses received on Sinai. In this way, the Mosaic Torah is contextualized among other divine revelations. Because the Mosaic Torah is only one aspect of the progressive revealing of the heavenly tablets, its deficiency is rectified by further revelation. For example, the progressive nature of the heavenly tablets’ disclosure is used by the author to explain the relatively lenient judgment of Reuben (*Jub.* 33:14–20). *Jubilees* views the partial revelation of the Mosaic Torah as being completed by the revelation of *more information from the heavenly tablets*. *Jubilees* itself offers divine revelation from the heavenly tablets that further defines the true meaning of the Mosaic Torah so that the covenant people are enabled to remain faithful.⁷⁰ This revelation is a necessary component for the sons of God to keep all of God’s commandments when the covenant is restored (*Jub.* 1:23–25).

Jubilees’ view that revelation works to redress the deficiency in the Mosaic law serves as a helpful point of comparison with Paul’s narration of the sons of God with respect to the law in Rom 8. With regard to reading both occurrences of νόμος in Rom 8:2 in the sense of Torah, commentators rightly question how the same entity can liberate people from itself. In other words, because the “law of the Spirit of life” that effects liberation from “the law of sin and death,” does not this logically imply two different entities? This is a legitimate question in so far as Torah is a static entity. As I argued above, however, the moment one allows for Torah to exist in different phases of salvation history or within different

⁷⁰ Cf. the related discussion of Rewritten Bible as essentially authoritative interpretation of the earlier texts in §2.1.

conditions, the objection falls flat. When the story of God’s sons in *Jubilees* and Romans are compared, both texts can be seen to share the view that divine action redresses the deficiency associated with the Torah. Interestingly, both authors locate the deficiency of the Torah as being *external* to the Torah. For *Jubilees*, Israel’s *interpretation* of the Mosaic law is deficient because the law was a partial revelation of the heavenly tablets. Therefore, for *Jubilees*, the revelation of more information will suffice. In contrast, Paul locates the weakness of the law in the σάρξ. Paul’s analysis of the problem in light of Christ requires that God send the Son in order to condemn sin in the flesh. In Paul’s view, the problem runs deeper than the author of *Jubilees*, or even he, could have anticipated before Christ came.⁷¹

I have argued that Paul links the motif of the Spirit to the sons of God in Rom 8:12–17 in strikingly similar ways as the author of *Jubilees*. For *Jubilees*, when Israel turned to God and the covenant was restored, God would give internal circumcision and a holy spirit as well as enable the people of Israel to adhere to all his commandments (*Jub.* 1:22–25; cf. §2.2.1.1). God’s actions would mark Israel out as the sons of the living God to every angel and spirit (*Jub.* 1:25), though when God reigns visibly from Mt. Zion *all will know* the identity of God’s sons (*Jub.* 1:28). I have shown that Paul, too, understands the Spirit as affirming the identity of the sons of God in the present time (Rom 8:16), while he also anticipates a future, full revelation (Rom 8:19). Further, the broader context of the Spirit in Romans suggests that this same Spirit that creates and confirms the sons of God also marks them out as new covenant members. Paul contrasts the “newness of the Spirit” with the “old written code” (Rom 7:5–6), a contrast which I argued should be understood as a new/old covenant contrast, much like 2 Cor 3. Moreover, the Spirit/letter contrast in Rom 2:29 is played out as a contrast between internal circumcision versus that which can be seen. Finally,

⁷¹ See N.T. Wright’s discussion of the “plight” and “reimagined plight” in light of the “solution” found in Christ; *Paul and the Faithfulness*, 747–764.

as in *Jubilees*, Paul sees divine intervention as enabling the sons of God to fulfill the righteous requirement of the law (Rom 8:1–4).

6.2.2 DIVINE SONSHIP AND RENEWED CREATION

Having shown that Rom 8:12–17 links the motif of the Spirit to the sons of God in an analogous fashion to *Jubilees*, I now examine Paul’s description of the future hope of the sons of God in Rom 8:18–30. In this passage, Paul connects the sons of God to the renewal of creation, which I argue should be understood as the Abrahamic inheritance.

In Rom 8:17, the discussion of divine sonship segues naturally into the inference that the children of God are also heirs of God, sharing in Christ’s inheritance and his glory. But, as with the identification of the sons of God, so the inheritance and glory of God’s sons stands in an eschatological tension: the sons of God first share in the suffering of Christ before sharing in his glory. Paul launches into a defense of his calculation (λογίζομαι) that the present suffering is well worth the glory to be revealed (v. 18), pursuing the argument until vv. 28–30, where he concludes with the sure confidence of glorification for those in Christ. The intervening material of vv. 19–27 consists of a series of three points (vv. 19–22, 23–25, 26–27) that support Paul’s calculation that the coming glory is worth enduring the present suffering (v. 18).⁷² For my argument, Paul’s first two points (vv. 19–22, 23–25) are the most relevant.

Verses 19–22 support Paul’s case by claiming that the future glory of the sons of God is so great that even non-human creation⁷³ anticipates its redemptive effects.⁷⁴ In Byrne’s

⁷² Cranfield, *Romans I–VIII*, 410; Stuhlmacher, *Romans*, 132.

⁷³ There is some discussion on the nature of κτίσις in vv. 19–22. Commentators’ suggestions include 1) “the creature” 2) “all creation” including human and non-human 3) “all creation” limited to the non-human aspects of the cosmos. A consensus seems to have emerged around the third option, argued clearly and persuasively by Adams. First, believers are distinguished from the κτίσις in vv. 22–23 (by the logic of “not only

words, Paul assumes the Jewish tradition of a “common fate” between humanity and creation.⁷⁵ Verses 20–21 serve as an expanded explanation of v. 19.⁷⁶ Verse 20 describes creation as divinely subjected to futility (τῇ ματαιότητι) against its will, likely alluding to the divine curses imposed after Adam’s sin (Gen 3:17–19; cf. Rom 1:20).⁷⁷ Though creation currently stands as a slave to decay, the creation’s anticipation is directed toward the freedom that comes with the glory of the children of God,⁷⁸ also termed the “revelation of the sons of God” in v. 19. Thus, the future redemption of creation is intertwined with the redemption of the sons of God. Verse 22 summarizes the previous verses by personifying creation as a pregnant woman groaning in pangs of labor and yet eagerly awaiting the anticipated outcome.

Verses 23–25 represent Paul’s second argument that the present suffering is well worth the future glory of the sons of God: not only⁷⁹ does the created order anticipate the future glory, but believers themselves anticipate and groan for the “adoption as sons, that is, the redemption of the body.” Believers have received the eschatological firstfruits of the Spirit,⁸⁰ yet precisely this Spirit produces⁸¹ the eager anticipation for adoption (v. 23). This

that”). Second, it seems unlikely that Paul would portray non-Christians as “eagerly awaiting” the revelation of the sons of God. E. Adams, *Constructing the World: A Study in Paul’s Cosmological Language* (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 2000), 176–177. Byrne also comes to the same conclusion, adding a further argument that creation was subjected to futility against its will, while humanity chose futility for itself (Rom 1:20). *Sons of God*, 105; Hahne, *Corruption and Redemption*, 181; Jonathan Moo, “Romans 8.19–22 and Isaiah’s Cosmic Covenant,” *NTS* 54.1 (2008): 75–77.

⁷⁴ Note that vv. 19–22 are linked to v. 18 with γάρ. Cf. Byrne, *Sons of God*, 104.

⁷⁵ Byrne, *Sons of God*, 104–107.

⁷⁶ Verses 20–21 are connected to v. 19 with γάρ.

⁷⁷ Hahne, *Corruption and Redemption*, 188.

⁷⁸ Romans 8:21: ...εἰς τὴν ἐλευθερίαν τῆς δόξης τῶν τέκνων τοῦ θεοῦ. The genitive chain is difficult to translate. Some opt to read τῆς δόξης as an attributive genitive, thus “glorious freedom,” e.g. NIV. The genitive, however, is more likely loosely one of association; Moo, *Romans*, 517 n. 48.

⁷⁹ Verse 23 starts with οὐ μόνον δέ, indicating the continuation of the previous argument.

⁸⁰ I take the genitival relationship of τὴν ἀπαρχὴν τοῦ πνεύματος as appositional, meaning “the firstfruits, that is, the Spirit,” as Käsemann, *Romans*, 237; Moo, *Romans*, 520 n. 61; Scott, *Adoption*, 258–259. Cranfield

“adoption” is defined as “the redemption of the body.” The anticipation created by the Spirit links the sons of God with *the* Son of God. Just as God raised Jesus from the dead, so God will give life to the mortal bodies of believers who are marked by the Spirit of God (v. 11). Thus, the believer’s present is characterized by hope for the unseen (vv. 24–25). Verses 23–25 raise the question as to how believers, who already are sons of God (v. 14) and have the Spirit of adoption (v. 15), still anticipate their *future* adoption. I take this issue up below, but for now it is enough to note that Paul’s adoption language exists in some eschatological tension.

I have noted already that the sons of God are being patterned after *the* Son of God, Jesus Christ. In vv. 18–25, Paul also describes the created order as following after the pattern of the sons of God. Creation’s present slavery to corruption (v. 21) corresponds to the past slavery of God’s sons (v. 15). Just as the sons of God groan (στενάζομεν) and eagerly anticipate (ἀπεκδεχόμενοι) adoption in v. 23, so creation groans (συστενάζει, v. 22) and anticipates (ἀπεκδέχεται, v. 19) the revelation of the sons of God (v. 19). If the sons of God are on a similar pattern as the Son of God, though a step behind as it were (vv. 10–11), then the created order follows behind yet one step further on a similar trajectory. At the culmination, however, the revelation of the sons of God, coming into their future glorification, manifests the redemption of the created order.

also decides on an appositional genitive, but suggests it means not so much the Holy Spirit himself but his present work in us; Cranfield, *Romans I–VIII*, 418. Jewett favors a possessive genitive, meaning the spirit remains the active force of God; Jewett, *Romans*, 518. These suggestions highlighting the activity of the Spirit draw out a true implication, but they seem to me to obscure the more basic point in light of the parallel in 2 Cor 5:5.

⁸¹ I take the participle ἔχοντες as causal, as Dunn, *Romans 1–8*, 473; Moo, *Romans*, 520; Scott, *Adoption*, 257 n. 125. That fact that the Spirit is equated with the “firstfruits” indicates that an eager expectation would be naturally linked with it. Others read a concessive participle, rendering it as “even though they have”; Käsemann, *Romans*, 237. Somewhat more generically, Jewett reads it as a simple attributive sense of believers “having” the first fruits of the Spirit; *Romans*, 518.

The connection between the redemption of the sons of God and the redemption of the created order provides a clear connection between *Jubilees* and Romans. As I showed earlier (Ch. 4), *Jubilees* similarly depicts creation following the same trajectory as the children of God. Just as the covenant people would follow a sin-exile-restoration pattern, so creation would descend into chaos and reach a low-point before being restored. Moreover, *Jubilees* couples this decay of the created order and gradual recovery to the gradual decline and elongation of human life spans. For *Jubilees*, the center of world history, both for God's sons and creation, is the repentance and restoration of the covenant people. In other words, the covenant restoration of Deut 30–31 stands as the center point between the creation of Gen 1–2 and the new creation of Isa 65–66. In *Jubilees*, the fate of creation followed the fate of the sons of God precisely because they were the Creator's *covenant people* and possessed a privileged status within the creation order.⁸² Romans 8 follows a similar pattern with respect to the sons of God and creation. Creation follows humanity into captivity and creation's liberation hinges on the revelation of God's sons and their anticipated redemption of the body. There are differences, of course. While *Jubilees* links creation's redemption to human life spans, Paul links it to resurrection. In addition, Paul does not envision a gradual decline and recovery as *Jubilees*. Nevertheless, both authors articulate fulfillment of the law and the renewal of creation through the extension of life itself, demonstrating again how both authors tend to compose similar themes and explore them in similar ways.

To this point in the thesis, I have shown that both Romans and *Jubilees* link the sons of God with a divinely given spirit, law fulfillment, and the renewing of creation. In *Jubilees*, a concept of God's covenant with his sons holds these motifs together. This suggests that

⁸² Genesis 1:26–29 gives humanity “dominion” over all the creatures of the earth. *Jubilees*, as shown earlier, interprets this dominion in specifically Israelite categories. The Garden is the Holy of holiness, Adam serves as a priest and offers incense. In other words, for *Jubilees*, Adam is the first of Israel's priests.

Paul is also operating with an implicit concept of the covenant that is similar to *Jubilees*. For *Jubilees*, the restoration of the sons of God and, subsequently, creation is explicitly linked to the restoration of the covenant with language drawn from Jewish scripture. *Jubilees* 1 clearly sets out the history of Israel within a sin, exile, restoration pattern, stitching together different covenantal passages with a particular focus on Deut 31. As shown above concerning *Jub.* 1:22–25 (§2.2.1.1), when the people returned to the Lord with their entire mind and soul, their father-son relationship with God would be restored. This renewed covenant relationship will consist of an internal circumcision of their minds, the creation of a holy spirit, and purification, all of which results in a people who perform God’s commandments. In the previous section, I have argued that Paul understands the Spirit who marks out the sons of God as the eschatological Spirit that gives internal circumcision (Rom 2:29) and enables law fulfillment (Rom 8:4). In this section, I have shown that the revelation of these same Spirit-led sons leads to the liberation of the created order. The accumulation of overlap suggests that the sort of explicit covenant logic that governs the sons of God in *Jubilees* is implicit within Paul’s thinking.

6.2.3 DIVINE SONSHIP AND THE ABRAHAMIC INHERITANCE

I have shown in the previous two sections that Rom 8 links the sons of God to the divinely given Spirit, internal circumcision, law fulfillment, and the renewing of creation in a fashion that is remarkably similar to the collocation of the same themes in *Jubilees*. In this section I show that the inheritance of God’s sons in Rom 8:17–30 should be equated to Abraham’s inheritance of the world in Rom 4:13. The implication, then, is that the sons of God are linked with the seed of Abraham in Rom 8, just as I argued the two categories overlap in Rom 9 and in *Jubilees*.

Romans 8:17 declares that the children of God are also the “heirs of God” and “fellow heirs with Christ.” The precise content of the inheritance is ambiguous. The phrase “heirs of God” could indicate that God himself is the believer’s inheritance.⁸³ Alternatively, the phrase could also mean that the sons are God’s heirs who will inherit God’s promises to Abraham.⁸⁴ Identifying the heirs of God with the Abrahamic heirs described in Rom 4:13 is a natural one for two reasons. First, Rom 4:13 and 8:17 are the only occurrences of the nominal “heirs” (κληρονόμος) in Romans. Second, the inheritance in 4:13 is “the world” (κόσμος) and the inheritance in Rom 8 is closely associated with the liberated “creation” (κτίσις), thus indicating a similar line of thinking in both passages. My contention is that these two options—believers inherit God himself and believers inherit the world—are not at all in tension and are probably both intended.⁸⁵

Reading a link to the Abrahamic inheritance in Rom 8:17 has not gone unchallenged.⁸⁶ Cranfield, in particular, suggests Rom 8:17 should be explained independently of Rom 4 and Gal 3–4 because of the marked differences between Paul’s “inheritance” passages. Summing up his observations, he states:

Rom 4 speaks of sons of Abraham and heirs of Abraham, but says nothing about sons of God or heirs of God; Gal 3–4 speaks of sons of Abraham and heirs of Abraham, of sons of God and of heirs through God, but not of heirs of God; and Rom 8 does not mention Abraham at all, but speaks of Christians being sons (or children) of God and also of their being heirs of God and joint-heirs with Christ.⁸⁷

⁸³ Cranfield, *Romans I–VIII*, 406–407; Murray, *Romans*, 298; Schreiner, *Romans*, 427.

⁸⁴ Κόσμος in 4:13 should be understood as non-human creation. According to a growing consensus, κτίσις should be understood in the same way in Rom 8:19–22. See n. 77 above and Adams, *Constructing the World*, 169; Forman, *Politics*, 63–70; Hester, *Inheritance*, 82.

⁸⁵ Similarly to Schreiner, *Romans*, 427–428.

⁸⁶ Morris comments that for Paul it is not so much ownership “as relationship that he has in mind. He [Paul] speaks of being *heirs of God*, a bold piece of imagery” (italics original); though, for Morris, “[i]t is difficult to see what possessions we share as fellow heirs with Christ; the title is surely one of dignity”; *Romans*, 317. Jewett follows Morris (*Romans*, 501).

⁸⁷ Cranfield, *Romans I–VIII*, 406–407.

The result for Cranfield is that “heirs of God” should not be read as meaning “simply ‘heirs of Abraham, who are to receive in due course the blessings which God promised to him and to his seed.’”⁸⁸ Thus, he reads the phrase κληρονόμοι ... θεοῦ as describing God’s self-giving as the content of the inheritance. In Cranfield’s words, Christian expectations “are of sharing not just in various blessings God is able to bestow but in that which is peculiarly His own, the perfect and imperishable glory of His own life.”⁸⁹ So, Cranfield’s objection to reading inheritance in Rom 8 in light of Abraham in Rom 4 is twofold. First, there is no mention of Abraham in the context of Rom 8. Second, though not explicitly, Cranfield seems to object that linking the two passages diminishes the meaning of “heirs of God.” It is important to note his wording: inheritance is “not to be explained as meaning *simply* ‘heirs of Abraham’”; and “Christians ... have great expectations ... these expectations are of sharing *not just* in various blessings God is able to bestow.”⁹⁰ For Cranfield, being heirs of God cannot be limited to being heirs of Abraham, and therefore the two must be categorically distinct. I take up each of Cranfield’s objections in turn.

Two points from the context support the contention that Abraham stands in the background. First, Paul’s description of the God who has raised Christ and will raise believers to new life in 8:11 recalls the description of the God in whom Abraham believed in 4:17 (“the God who gives life to the dead and calls into existence the things that do not exist”). Second, as discussed earlier, chapters 8 and 9 are closely linked. The identity and blessings of God’s sons in Rom 8 creates the deep despair and theological dilemma Paul addresses in Rom 9 pertaining to those who have the Sinai “adoption” (Rom 9:4). There Paul

⁸⁸ Cranfield, *Romans I-VIII*, 407.

⁸⁹ Cranfield, *Romans I-VIII*, 407.

⁹⁰ Cranfield, *Romans I-VIII*, 407. Italics added.

freely moves from divine sonship language to Abraham's seed without the need for argumentation in his explanation of Gen 21:12 (Rom 9:7–8). So, if the sons of God are equivalent to the descendants of Abraham when Paul turns to resolving the theological problem (Rom 9), then there is reason to believe that in the course of Paul's development of the problem he is working with the same categories despite not mentioning sons of Abraham in Rom 8. In addition, outside of Romans, the logic of Gal 3–4 moves similarly from Abraham's offspring (Gal 3:14, 29) to adoption as God's sons with the attendant Spirit crying "Abba! Father" (Gal 3:26; 4:5–7). In light of these parallels, the difference in wording of κληρονόμοι θεοῦ (Rom 8:17) and κληρονόμος διὰ θεοῦ (Gal 4:7) does not seem an adequate reason to disallow the link between the two passages, as Cranfield asserts. Finally, a circumstantial piece of evidence contributes to the case that Abraham is integrated into Paul's discussion of inheritance and sonship in Rom 8. Paul appears to employ the language of Gen 22:12, 16 and the *aqedah* in Rom 8:32: "He who did not withhold (ἐφείσατο) his own Son, but gave him up for all of us."⁹¹

Cranfield's second objection against understanding the heirs of God in Rom 8:17 in light of the descendants of Abraham in Rom 4:13 is that the connection diminishes the status of the heirs of God. According to Cranfield, if the heirs of God are merely recipients of various blessings, then we have underestimated Paul's expectations for the sons of God. In this regard, Cranfield has simply created a false dichotomy between inheriting blessings from God *and* enjoying God's self-given presence. It is unlikely that Paul as a Jewish author of the

⁹¹ Gen 22:12c: οὐκ ἐφείσω τοῦ υἱοῦ σου τοῦ ἀγαπητοῦ δι' ἐμέ. See Campbell, "Story of Jesus," 113–118; Forman, *Politics*, 106; Scott, *Adoption*, 249. In contrast, Jewett does not allow for the allusion to Gen 22 because of similar wording used in other LXX passages, e.g. 2 Sam 18:5; 21:7, 9 (*Romans*, 537). The passages Jewett cites, however, isolate the term φείδομαι, while the force of the allusion comes precisely from the combination of the act of "sparing" and the identity of the one spared, namely, a "son." My intention is not to define precisely how an allusion to the *aqedah* functions for Paul, but merely to identify an allusion to the Abraham narrative within the context of the inheritance language.

time period would consider the category of “heir of Abraham” as diminishing the sons of God in any way. This is a questionable distinction primarily because Paul appears to move freely between the categories in Rom 9:7–8 and Gal 3; accordingly, there is no adequate reason to disallow the connection between the heirs of Rom 8:17 and Rom 4:13, especially in light of the sparse use of “heirs” in Romans and the similar content (κόσμος/κτίσις). The heirs of God inherit the promises of Abraham.

Yet, there is also good reason to understand the heirs of God as inheriting God himself. The logic of v. 17 coordinates glorification with Christ to the believer’s inheritance.⁹² Because of this, “glory” sheds some light on the nature of the inheritance. The motif of “glory” and “glorification” occurs numerous times in the section (vv. 17, 18, 21, 30). As Jewett observes, Paul’s use of “glory” is far from the classical Greek sense of opinion, reputation, or renown ascribed by public opinion. Rather, Paul’s conception is rooted in the Hebrew sense of כבוד and the use of δόξα as filtered through the LXX translations, thus indicating a visible, fiery presence, splendor, or power.⁹³ The more specific phrase δόξα θεοῦ in the LXX is the “‘divine glory’ which reveals the nature of God in creation and in His acts... Thus the ‘divine radiance’ at the giving of the Law, or in the tabernacle or the temple, is very properly to be rendered δόξα.”⁹⁴ To this point in Romans, glory-language primarily concerns the glory of God that will be enjoyed by the redeemed at the eschaton (Rom 2:7, 10; 5:2; 9:23) or, conversely, the same divine glory of which sinful humanity continually falls short (Rom 1:23; 3:23). The eschatological expectation of believers in Rom 8:17–30 as

⁹² Macaskill, *Union*, 242.

⁹³ Jewett, *Romans*, 510.

⁹⁴ Kittel, “Δόξα,” 244. Cf. Exod 24:16–17; 40:34; Lev 9:23–24; 2 Chr 7:1; Isa 6:3–4; Ezek 10:4; 43:2. Carey Newman’s study of the HB phrase כבוד יהוה reaches a similar conclusion: “the collocation כבוד יהוה signifies the visible and mobile presence of Yahweh. כבוד יהוה’s close association with special places (places where Yahweh is commonly depicted as being present) and special people (people who are especially close to Yahweh) confirms this conclusion” *Glory*, 24.

“glorification with Christ” (v. 17), “glory revealed to us” (v. 18), and the “freedom of the glory of the children of God” (v. 21) all point, at the very least, to believers reflecting the splendor and radiance of God. Thus I concur with Forman, who concludes,

When Paul uses the word “glory” in this context (vv. 18, 21, 30), it carries the usual sense of God’s radiance and brilliance but it is applied particularly to “the whole creation” (πᾶσα ἡ κτίσις, v. 22) which will be liberated by God.⁹⁵

The eschatological expectation of the glorification of the children of God then correlates with the eschatological expectation of God’s radiant presence drawing near once again to his sons, and so to all creation. So, because the inheritance of God’s sons is interchangeable with the glorification of God’s sons, one is justified in understanding the inheritance as enjoying the presence of God.

There is reason, then, to understand the “heirs of God” in Rom 8:17 both as those who inherit God’s promises to Abraham *as well as* God’s own presence. Indeed, if these are both blessings of the covenant, there is no reason to see these in tension with one another. For as Schreiner notes, “The supreme benefit of the covenant with Abraham is not inheriting the land but having God as one’s God (Gen. 17:7).”⁹⁶ The seed of Abraham as the covenant members would be precisely those who would enjoy the *presence* of God within the land *given* by God.

Jubilees shares this same type of logic. As I argued in §3.2.2, despite Abraham’s seed being heirs of the earth (*Jub.* 17:3), one of *Jubilees*’ priorities is that Israel would inherit a specific plot of land in the center of the earth. The reason for this specific location was because God’s presence dwelt in that land. Indeed, Israel’s inheritance contained the *omphalos* of the earth, the connection between heaven and earth. In other words, both Paul and the author of *Jubilees* would be puzzled at the choice of *either* God’s blessing of the land

⁹⁵ Forman, *Politics*, 114. Cf. Dunn, *Romans 1-8*, 59.

⁹⁶ Schreiner, *Romans*, 425–426.

(or renewed creation) *or* God's self-given presence. These two fit hand-in-hand within the logic of the covenant.

The comparison of Romans and *Jubilees* suggests one further point on this passage. The event which the created order anticipates is the "revelation of the sons of God" (v. 19), which is restated as the "freedom of the glory of the children of God" (v. 21). I have shown that the Spirit currently attests to the identity of the sons of God, but for Paul their identity will be fully revealed only with this eschatological event. Similarly, in *Jubilees*, I have shown that at the restoration of the covenant the sons of God are first marked out so that all angels and spirits will know them (*Jub.* 1:25). Later at the eschatological culmination, all will know that the Lord is the father of Jacob's children because the Lord will appear in the sight of all and rule from Mt. Zion (*Jub.* 1:28). Paul may understand the "revelation of the sons of God" to be coordinated with the "glory of the children of God" because he, too, expects the visible presence of the Lord to validate the identity of the sons of God.

In this section, then, I have shown that the "heirs of God" in Rom 8:17 are simultaneous recipients of God's presence as well as God's promises to Abraham. This indicates that Paul conceives of the sons of God in Rom 8 as overlapping with the seed of Abraham just as the categories overlap in Rom 9:7–8 and in *Jubilees*. Moreover, both Romans and *Jubilees* connect the motif of a divinely given spirit to divine sonship. In both, this God-given spirit marks its recipients with internal circumcision and enables the fulfillment of the law. Finally, both authors coordinate the full revelation of the identity of God's children with the renewal of the created order. In sum, Paul has situated his discussion of God's sons in Rom 8:12–30 within the same set of motifs that *Jubilees* collocates around the sons of God. *Jubilees* links these motifs through an explicitly covenantal logic, suggesting that Paul works with a similar, yet implicit logic in Rom 8.

6.3 CONCLUSION

Drawing back to the larger argument of the thesis, I have shown that Paul collocates the themes of a divinely given Spirit, the renewal of creation, and Abrahamic descent to the “sons of God” in a remarkably similar fashion as *Jubilees*. The interlinking of these themes through an explicitly covenantal logic in *Jubilees* suggests Paul works with an implicit conception of “sons of God” as covenant members, similar to the one found in *Jubilees*.

Concerning God’s giving of the Spirit, I also noted shared characteristics expressed in both *Jubilees* and Romans. Namely, I found that Rom 8:12–17 describes the work of the Spirit as creating and confirming the sons of God. From the broader context in Romans, I showed that the Spirit marks the transition from the salvation historical era of the “old written code” to the era of the “newness of the Spirit” (Rom 7:5–6). Paul uses similar descriptors in 2 Cor 3:6–7 to explicitly contrast Paul’s own ministry of the “new covenant” with Moses’ ministry of “death,” which entailed “letters inscribed on stone.” Those who are included in this era of the Spirit are marked by internal circumcision (Rom 2:29) and are enabled to fulfill the righteous requirement of the law (Rom 8:4). Similarly in *Jubilees*, when the salvation historical era shifts and the “sons of God” are restored to the covenant, God will create a “holy spirit” for Israel and circumcise their minds with the result that they will perform all his commandments (*Jub.* 1:22–25).

Further, Romans and *Jubilees* both link creation’s ultimate restoration to the sons of God. In Rom 8:18–25, Paul estimates that the future glory of the sons of God far outweighs the present suffering because the glory includes the restoration of the non-human creation. For Paul, creation follows the pattern of the sons of God just as the sons of God follow the pattern of *the* Son of God, Christ. Moreover, creation’s anticipation is linked to the

resurrection of the sons of God. Likewise, *Jubilees* also connects the restoration of non-human creation to the pattern of the sons of God. For *Jubilees*, because the sons of God are explicitly in covenant with the God of creation, Israel's covenant unfaithfulness leads to the decay and breakdown of the created order while their faithfulness leads to its restoration. *Jubilees*, too, links the decline and restoration of creation to the decline and restoration of human life spans.

Finally, I argued that the inheritance of the sons of God in Rom 8:17 should be equated with the Abrahamic inheritance in Rom 4:13; thus, Paul would then be considering the sons of God in Rom 8 as equivalent to the descendants of Abraham (cf. Rom 9:7–8). The key to this argument is recognizing that being “heirs of God” entails receiving *both* the divine self-giving *as well as* the Abrahamic promises. In this way, Paul links the “inheritance” and “glorification” of believers because, similarly to *Jubilees*, he conceives of the sons of God enjoying God's presence within the land given by God.

The simplest explanation of these parallel descriptions of God's children is that both authors are governed by the shared heritage of the Jewish scriptures and a common interpretation of this heritage. The shared elements between *Jubilees*' and Roman's depiction of God's sons are recognizably covenantal elements. Both *Jubilees* and Romans describe the sons of God as those who are the seed of Abraham, who fulfill the law, and who possess the Spirit/a holy spirit and internal circumcision. Both works assume that the identity of the children of God is veiled at present but will be fully revealed in the future when God's presence dwells with them and the created order is restored.

At this juncture, the distinction between the $\nu\iota\omicron\theta\epsilon\sigma\acute{\iota}\alpha$ in Rom 9 and that in Rom 8 becomes clear. For Paul, the “adoption” marked by the Spirit is eschatological and the “adoption” marked by the “giving of the law” is not. In Paul's understanding, the Israelites

stand in the family-line of the patriarchs, but not all have reached their eschatological climax in Christ (Rom 9:4–5). Yet, the two “adoptions” are also related. As Israel was formally ratified as God’s son with the giving of the law of Sinai in anticipation of their inheritance, namely, the land, so too the participants of the eschatological new covenant are ratified as God’s sons with the Spirit in anticipation of their inheritance, namely, God’s presence in the new creation.

CONCLUSION

I have argued that both *Jubilees* and Romans collocate the motifs of a divinely given spirit, law fulfillment, renewed creation, and Abrahamic descent with the theme of divine sonship because the authors share assumptions about God's covenant relationship with Israel as it relates to being "God's sons." For *Jubilees*, the logic of covenant membership explicitly holds together the collocation of motifs around divine sonship. I have argued in this thesis that Paul employs an analogous, though implicit covenantal logic surrounding the "sons of God" in Romans. Though both authors bring together the same motifs, there are marked differences, which serve to highlight each author's theological emphases. Nevertheless, the elements of Paul's depiction of the "sons of God" in Romans contribute to a narrative substructure that is remarkably similar to the more robust narrative in *Jubilees*.

In the first half of the thesis, I argued that divine sonship in *Jubilees* marked out covenant membership and, thereby, I established the underlying logical relationship between being a "son of God" and being in God's covenant. To support my argument, I showed how *Jubilees*' broader covenantal theology is made evident in passages where the author rewrites the narratives of Genesis and the first portion of Exodus specifically in order to anchor Israel's covenant relationship with God in creation (*Jub.* 2), at the restoration of the covenant (*Jub.* 1:22–25), and at the culmination of history (*Jub.* 1:26–29). Thus, Israel as the sons of God participated in the same covenant as Adam, Enoch, Shem, Noah, Abraham, and Jacob. This covenant is marked by God's giving to his children a "holy spirit" and providing the circumcision of the mind. Further, I showed how Israel's status as God's sons was built into

the spatial-temporal fabric of the cosmos because they were entrusted with the sacred space on earth and the observance of the sacred times. Because of this status within creation, the faithfulness or unfaithfulness of the sons of God to the covenant brought ramifications on the remainder of creation. Thus, in the eschatological expectation of *Jubilees*, the sons of God will be marked out by the visible presence of God dwelling on Mt. Zion within the new creation.

In the second half of the thesis, I argued that Paul's use of divine sonship language in Rom 9 is used to mark out members of the covenant, particularly in relation to Abraham's descendants. In Rom 9:4–5, Paul's "adoption" connected with the "giving of the law" designates the ratification of the Sinai covenant. In a striking contrast with *Jubilees*, however, Paul argues that the Abrahamic covenant should be distinguished from the Sinai covenant because those who have the "adoption" linked with the "giving of the law" are not necessarily equivalent to those who are "children of God" according to the Abrahamic promise (Rom 9:6–8). Rather, those who have the "adoption" associated with the Spirit in Rom 8:15 will participate in the Abrahamic inheritance of the divine presence and the restored creation. Indeed, the suffering that these "sons of God" endure in the present is well worth it because even the created order anticipates their glorification.

While the author of *Jubilees* and Paul clearly have considerable theological differences, I have found a remarkable degree of shared assumptions between the two. Both authors assume a legitimate claim to be sons of God will necessarily link to Abraham's descendants. Both authors assume that each of their respective community's claim to be the sons of God will be vindicated despite the current circumstances through an eschatological revelation. Both authors link the eschatological revealing of God's sons with the renewed

creation. Both associate the sons of God with the covenant language of the Spirit/a new spirit, internal circumcision, and law fulfillment.

Reading *Jubilees* and Romans together allows interpreters to document textual overlap in reference to important thematic units like “God’s sons” and, thus, to reveal underlying logic motivating both authors. This demonstrates that Paul maintains—in a substantive, deeply held way—an explicitly ancient Jewish idea of the covenant relationship to God even after Christ, one that was informed by a much earlier tradition also expressed in *Jubilees*. Put another way, the narrative substructure underlying the sons of God in Rom 8 and 9 bears remarkable resemblances to the narrative of the sons of God in *Jubilees* because of a shared covenantal logic.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Abasciano, Brian J. *Paul's Use of the Old Testament in Romans 9.1-9: An Intertextual and Theological Exegesis*. 1st ed. T&T Clark, 2006.
- Adams, E. *Constructing the World: A Study in Paul's Cosmological Language*. Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 2000.
- Alexander, Philip S. "Jerusalem as the Omphalos of the World: On the History of a Geographical Concept." *Judaism* 46.2 (1997): 147–58.
- . "Notes on the 'Imago Mundi' of the Book of Jubilees." *JJS* 33.1–2 (1982): 197–213.
- Anderson, Gary. "Celibacy or Consummation in the Garden? Reflections on Early Jewish and Christian Interpretations of the Garden of Eden." *HTR* 82 (1989): 121–48.
- Anderson, Gary A. "The Status of the Torah Before Sinai: The Retelling of the Bible in the Damascus Covenant and the Book of Jubilees." *DSD* 1 (1994): 1–29.
- Badenas, Robert. *Christ: The End of the Law: Romans 10.4 in Pauline Perspective*. JSNT 10. Sheffield: JSOT, 1985.
- Barclay, John M. G. "'I Will Have Mercy on Whom I Have Mercy': The Golden Calf and Divine Mercy in Romans 9-11 and Second Temple Judaism." *Early Christianity* 1.1 (2010): 82–106.
- . *Paul and the Gift*. Grand Rapids, Michigan: Eerdmans Publishing Co, 2015.
- . "Unnerving Grace: Approaching Romans 9-11 from the Wisdom of Solomon." Pages 91–109 in *Between Gospel and Election*. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2010.
- Barrett, C. K. *A Commentary on the Epistle to the Romans*. Black's New Testament Commentaries. London: A & C Black, 1971.
- Behm, Johannes. "Ἀνάθεμα, Ἀνάθημα, Κατάθεμα." *TDNT* 1:354–56.
- Beker, J. C. *Paul the Apostle: The Triumph of God in Life and Thought*. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1984.
- Bergsma, John S. "The Relationship between Jubilees and the Early Enochic Books (Astronomical Book and Book of the Watchers)." Pages 36–51 in *Enoch and the Mosaic Torah: The Evidence of Jubilees*. Grand Rapids, Mich.: Eerdmans, 2009.
- Bousset, Wilhelm. *Kyrios Christos: A History of the Belief in Christ from the Beginnings of Christianity to Irenaeus*. Translated by John E. Steely. Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1970.
- Brooke, George J. "Exegetical Strategies in Jubilees 1-2: New Light from 4QJubileesa." Pages 39–57 in *Studies in the Book of Jubilees*. Edited by Matthias Albani, Jörg Frey, and Armin Lange. Texts and Studies in Ancient Judaism 65. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1997.

- . “Rewritten Bible.” *Encyclopedia of the Dead Sea Scrolls*.
- Buchanan, George Wesley. “The Covenant in Legal Context.” Pages 27–52 in *Concept of the Covenant in the Second Temple Period*. Leiden: Brill, 2003.
- Burke, Trevor J. *Adopted into God’s Family: Exploring a Pauline Metaphor*. NSBT 22. Nottingham: Apollos, 2006.
- Byrne, Brendan. “Review: Adoption as Sons of God.” *J Theol Studies* 44.1 (1993): 288–94.
- Byrne, Brendan J. *Sons of God - Seed of Abraham: A Study of the Idea of the Sonship of God of All Christians in Paul Against the Jewish Background*. Biblical Inst. Press, 1979.
- Campbell, Douglas A. “The Story of Jesus in Romans and Galatians.” Pages 97–124 in *Narrative Dynamics in Paul: A Critical Assessment*. Edited by Bruce W Longenecker. Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 2002.
- Campbell, Douglas A. *The Deliverance of God: An Apocalyptic Rereading of Justification in Paul*. Cambridge: Eerdmans, 2009.
- Christiansen, E. Juhl. *The Covenant in Judaism and Paul: A Study of Ritual Boundaries as Identity Markers*. AGJU. Leiden: Brill, 1995.
- Collins, John J. “Introduction: Towards the Morphology of a Genre.” *Semina* 14 (1979): 1–20.
- Cranfield, C. E. B. *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Epistle to the Romans*. 6th ed. Vol. 2 of ICC. Edinburgh: Clark, 1979.
- . *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Epistle to the Romans*. 6th ed. Vol. 1 of ICC. Edinburgh: Clark, 1975.
- Cross, F. M. “Kinship and Covenant in Ancient Israel.” Pages 3–21 in *From Epic to Canon: History and Literature in Ancient Israel*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1998.
- Davenport, Gene L. *The Eschatology of the Book of Jubilees*. Leiden: Brill, 1971.
- Davies, W. D. “Paul and the People of Israel.” *NTS* 24.1 (1977): 4–39.
- DeJong, David N. “The Decline of Human Longevity in the Book of Jubilees.” *JSP* 21.4 (2012): 340–65.
- Dillmann, August. *Lexicon Linguae Aethiopicae: Cum Indice Latino*. New York: Frederick Ungar, 1955.
- Dimant, Devorah. “The Biography of Enoch and the Books of Enoch.” *VT* 33 (1983): 14–29.
- Dodd, C. H. *The Epistle of Paul to the Romans*. The Moffatt New Testament Commentary. London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1932.

- Doering, Lutz. "Purity and Impurity in the Book of Jubilees." Pages 261–75 in *Enoch and the Mosaic Torah: The Evidence of Jubilees*. Edited by Gabriele Boccaccini and Giovanni Ibba. Grand Rapids, Mich.: Eerdmans, 2009.
- . "Reinheit Und Tempel: Ein Beitrag Zum Verhältnis von Law Und Narrative Im Jubiläenbuch." Pages 243–62 in *Law and Narrative in the Bible and in Neighbouring Ancient Cultures*. Edited by Klaus-Peter Adam, Friedrich Avemarie, and Nili Wazana. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2012.
- . "The Concept of the Sabbath in the Book of Jubilees." Pages 179–205 in *Studies in the Book of Jubilees*. Edited by Matthias Albani, Jörg Frey, and Armin Lange. Tübingen: Mohr, 1997.
- Dunn, James D. G. *Romans 1-8*. Word Biblical Commentary 38A. Dallas: Word Books, 1988.
- . *Romans 9-16*. WBC 38B. Dallas: Word Books, 1988.
- . *The Theology of Paul the Apostle*. Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1998.
- Ego, Beate. "Heilige Zeit - Heiliger Raum - Heiliger Mensch: Beobachtungen Zur Struktur Der Gesetzesbegründung in Der Schöpfungs- Und Paradiesgeschichte Des Jubiläenbuches." Pages 207–19 in *Studies in the Book of Jubilees*. Edited by Matthias Albani, Jörg Frey, and Armin Lange. Tübingen: Mohr, 1997.
- Eiss, Werner. "Das Wochenfest Im Jubiläenbuch Und Im Antiken Judentum." Pages 165–78 in *Studies in the Book of Jubilees*. Edited by Matthias Albani, Jörg Frey, and Armin Lange. Tübingen: Mohr, 1997.
- Elliott, Neil. *The Rhetoric of Romans*. JSNTSup 45. Sheffield Academic, 1990.
- Endres, John C. *Biblical Interpretation in the Book of Jubilees*. CBQMS 18. Washington, DC: Catholic Biblical Association of America, 1987.
- Fee, Gordon D. *God's Empowering Presence: The Holy Spirit in the Letters of Paul*. Peabody, Mass: Hendrickson Publishers, 1994.
- Fitzmyer, Joseph A., ed. *Romans: A New Translation and Commentary*. The Anchor Bible 33. New York: Doubleday, 1993.
- Flebbe, Jochen. *Solus Deus: Untersuchungen Zur Rede von Gott Im Brief Des Paulus an Die Römer*. BZNW 159. Berlin: Walter De Gruyter, 2008.
- Forman, Mark. *The Politics of Inheritance in Romans*. Cambridge, U.K.: Cambridge University Press, 2011.
- Frey, Jörg. "Zum Weltbild Im Jubiläenbuch." Pages 261–92 in *Studies in the Book of Jubilees*. Edited by Matthias Albani, Jörg Frey, and Armin Lange. Tübingen: Mohr, 1997.

- Gaius. *The Institutes of Gaius*. Translated by Francis de Zulueta. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1946.
- García Martínez, Florentino. "4QMess Ar and the Book of Noah." Pages 1–44 in *Qumran and Apocalyptic*. Leiden: Brill, 1992.
- . "The Heavenly Tablets in the Book of Jubilees." Pages 243–60 in *Studies in the Book of Jubilees*. Edited by Matthias Albani, Jörg Frey, and Armin Lange. Tübingen: Mohr, 1997.
- Gaston, Lloyd. *Paul and the Torah*. Vancouver: University of British Columbia Press, 1987.
- Gilders, William K. "The Concept of Covenant in Jubilees." Pages 178–92 in *Enoch and the Mosaic Torah: The Evidence of Jubilees*. Edited by Gabriele Boccaccini and Giovanni Ibba. Grand Rapids, Mich.: Eerdmans, 2009.
- Godet, F. *Commentary on the Epistle to the Romans*. Translated by A. Cusin and Talbot W. Chambers. Grand Rapids, Mich: Zondervan, 1956.
- Goldstein, Jonathan A. "The Date of the Book of Jubilees." *AAJR* 50 (1983): 63–86.
- Gordon, Cyrus Herzl. "Biblical Customs and the Nuzu Tablets." *BA* 3.1 (1940): 1–12.
- Hafemann, Scott J. "The Salvation of Israel in Romans 11:25-32 : A Response to Krister Stendahl." *Ex Auditu* 4 (1988): 38–58.
- Hahn, Scott. *Kinship by Covenant: A Canonical Approach to the Fulfillment of God's Saving Promises*. The Anchor Yale Bible Reference Library. New Haven, Conn.: Yale University Press, 2009.
- Hahne, Harry Alan. *The Corruption and Redemption of Creation: Nature in Romans 8.19-22 and Jewish Apocalyptic Literature*. LNTS 336. London: T & T Clark, 2006.
- Halpern-Amaru, Betsy. "Exile and Return in Jubilees." Pages 127–44 in *Exile: Old Testament, Jewish, and Christian Conceptions*. Edited by James M. Scott. JSJSup 56. Leiden: Brill, 1997.
- . *Rewriting the Bible: Land and Covenant in Post-Biblical Jewish Literature*. Valley Forge, Pa: Trinity Press International, 1994.
- Hanneken, Todd R. *The Subversion of the Apocalypses in the Book of Jubilees*. Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2012.
- Hays, Richard B. *Echoes of Scripture in the Letters of Paul*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1989.
- . *The Faith of Jesus Christ: The Narrative Substructure of Galatians 3:1-4:11*. 2nd ed. The Biblical Resource Series. Cambridge, U.K.: W.B. Eerdmans, 2002.

- Heim, Erin. "Light through a Prism: New Avenues of Inquiry for the Pauline Υιοθεσία Metaphors". Ph.D. thesis, University of Otago, 2014.
- Heim, Erin M. *Adoption in Galatians and Romans: Contemporary Metaphor Theories and the Pauline Huiothesia Metaphors*. Biblical Interpretation Series. Leiden: Brill, 2017.
- Hengel, Martin. *The Son of God: The Origin of Christology and the History of Jewish-Hellenistic Religion*. Translated by John Bowden. London: S.C.M. Press, 1976.
- Hester, James D. *Paul's Concept of Inheritance: A Contribution to the Understanding of Heilsgeschichte*. Scottish Journal of Theology Occasional Papers 14. London: Oliver & Boyd, 1968.
- Himmelfarb, Martha. "Jubilees' Kingdom of Priests." Pages 53–84 in *A Kingdom of Priests: Ancestry and Merit in Ancient Judaism*. Jewish Culture and Contexts. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2011.
- . "The Book of Jubilees and Early Jewish Mysticism." Pages 384–94 in *Enoch and the Mosaic Torah: The Evidence of Jubilees*. Edited by Gabriele Boccaccini and Giovanni Ibba. Grand Rapids, Mich.: Eerdmans, 2009.
- . "The Book of Noah: A New Translation and Introduction." Pages 40–46 in *Old Testament Pseudepigrapha: More Noncanonical Scriptures*. Edited by Richard Bauckham, James R. Davila, and Alexander Panayotov. 1. Cambridge: Eerdmans, 2013.
- . "Torah, Testimony, and Heavenly Tablets: The Claim to Authority of the Book of Jubilees." Pages 19–29 in *A Multiform Heritage: Studies on Early Judaism and Christianity in Honor of Robert A. Kraft*. Edited by B.G. Wright. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1999.
- Hodge, Charles. *Commentary on the Epistle to the Romans*. Grand Rapids, Mich: Eerdmans, 1972.
- Hubbard, Moyer V. *New Creation in Paul's Letters and Thought*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002.
- Hübner, Hans. *Law in Paul's Thought*. Translated by J. C. G. Greig. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1984.
- Hugenberger, Gordon. *Marriage as a Covenant: A Study of Biblical Law and Ethics Governing Marriage Developed, from the Perspective of Malachi*. Supplements to Vetus Testamentum v. 52. New York: Brill, 1994.
- Hurtado, L. W. "Son of God." *Dictionary of Paul and His Letters*, 900–906.
- Hvalvik, Reidar. "A 'Sonderweg' for Israel: A Critical Examination of a Current Interpretation of Romans 11:25-27." *JSNT* 38 (1990): 87–107.
- Jewett, Robert. *Romans: A Commentary*. Hermeneia. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2007.

- Johnson, E. Elizabeth. "Romans 9-11: The Faithfulness and Impartiality of God." Pages 211–39 in *Pauline Theology, Volume III: Romans*. Edited by David M. Hay and E. Elizabeth Johnson. Minneapolis, Minn.: Fortress Press, 1995.
- Käsemann, Ernst. *Commentary on Romans*. Translated by Geoffrey W. Bromiley. London: SCM Press, 1980.
- . *Perspectives on Paul*. Translated by Margaret Kohl. The New Testament Library. London: S.C.M. Press, 1971.
- Keck, Leander E. *Romans*. Nashville, TN: Abingdon Press, 2005.
- Kittel, Gerhard. "Δὸξα." *TDNT* II:242–55.
- Koch, D.-A. *Die Schrift Als Zeuge Des Evangeliums: Untersuchungen Zur Verwendung Und Zum Verständnis Der Schrift Bei Paulus*. BHT 69. Tübingen: Mohr-Siebeck, 1986.
- Kugel, James. "The Jubilees Apocalypse." *DSD* 1 (1994): 322–37.
- Kugel, James L. "4Q369 'Prayer of Enosh' and Ancient Biblical Interpretation." *DSD* 2 (1998): 119.
- . *A Walk through Jubilees: Studies in the Book of Jubilees and the World of Its Creation*. JSJSup v. 156. Leiden: Brill, 2012.
- Kurylowicz, Marek. "Adoption on the Evidence of the Papyri." *JJP* 19 (1983): 61–75.
- Lambdin, Thomas Oden. *Introduction to Classical Ethiopic (Ge'ez)*. HSS 24. Missoula, Mont.: Scholars Press, 1978.
- Lambert, David. "Did Israel Believe That Redemption Awaited Its Repentance? The Case of Jubilees 1." *CBQ* 68 (2006): 631–50.
- Leenhardt, Franz J. *The Epistle to the Romans*. Translated by Harold Knight. London: Lutterworth Press, 1962.
- Levison, John R. *Portraits of Adam in Early Judaism: From Sirach to 2 Baruch*. JSPSup 1. Sheffield: JSOT, 1987.
- Linebaugh, Jonathan A. *God, Grace, and Righteousness in Wisdom of Solomon and Paul's Letter to the Romans: Texts in Conversation*. NovTSup 152. Leiden: Brill, 2013.
- Lohse, Eduard. *Der Brief an Die Römer*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2003.
- Longenecker, Bruce W. "Different Answers to Different Issues: Israel, the Gentiles and Salvation History in Romans 9-11." *JSNT* 36 (1989): 95–123.
- . *Eschatology and the Covenant: A Comparison of 4 Ezra and Romans 1-11*. JSOT 57. Sheffield: JSOT, 1991.

- Lyall, Francis. "Roman Law in the Writings of Paul: Adoption." *JBL* 88.4 (1969): 458–66.
- . *Slaves, Citizens, Sons: Legal Metaphors in the Epistles*. Grand Rapids, Mich: Zondervan Pub. House, 1984.
- Macaskill, Grant. *Revealed Wisdom and Inaugurated Eschatology in Ancient Judaism and Early Christianity*. Leiden: Brill, 2007.
- . *Union with Christ in the New Testament*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2014.
- Malul, Meir. "Adoption of Foundlings in the Bible and Mesopotamian Documents: A Study of Some Legal Metaphors in Ezekiel 16:1-7." *JSOT* 46 (1990): 97–126.
- McCarthy, Dennis J. "Israel, My First-Born Son." *The Way* 5 (1965): 183–91.
- Metzger, Bruce M. *A Textual Commentary on the Greek New Testament*. Stuttgart: United Bible Societies, 1975.
- Moo, Douglas J. *The Epistle to the Romans*. NICNT. Cambridge: W.B. Eerdmans, 1996.
- . "The Theology of Romans 9-11: A Response to E. Elizabeth Johnson." Pages 240–58 in *Pauline Theology, Vol. 3: Romans*. Edited by D. M. Hay and E. E. Johnson. Minneapolis, Minn.: Fortress Press, 1995.
- Moo, Jonathan. "Romans 8.19-22 and Isaiah's Cosmic Covenant." *NTS* 54.1 (2008): 74–89.
- Morales, Rodrigo J. *The Spirit and the Restoration of Israel: New Exodus and New Creation Motifs in Galatians*. WUNT 2 282. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2010.
- Morisada Rietz, Henry W. "Synchronizing Worship: Jubilees as a Tradition for the Qumran Community." Pages 111–18 in *Enoch and Qumran Origins: New Light on a Forgotten Connection*. Edited by Gabriele Boccaccini. Grand Rapids, Mich.: Eerdmans, 2005.
- Morris, Leon. *The Epistle to the Romans*. PNTC. Cambridge: Eerdmans Publishing, 1988.
- Munck, Johannes. *Christ and Israel: An Interpretation of Romans 9-11*. Translated by Ingeborg Nixon. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1967.
- Murray, John. *The Epistle to the Romans*. NICNT. Grand Rapids, Mich: Eerdmans, 1968.
- Najman, Hindy. "Interpretation as Primordial Writing: Jubilees and Its Authority Conferring Strategies." *JSJ* 30.4 (1999): 379–410.
- . *Seconding Sinai: The Development of Mosaic Discourse in Second Temple Judaism*. JSJSup 77. Leiden: Brill, 2002.
- Newman, Carey C. *Paul's Glory Christology: Tradition and Rhetoric*. NovTSup 69. Leiden: Brill, 1992.

- Newsom, Carol A., ed. *Songs of the Sabbath Sacrifice: A Critical Edition*. Harvard Semitic Studies 27. Atlanta, Ga: Scholars, 1985.
- Peppard, Michael. "Adopted and Begotten Sons of God: Paul and John on Divine Sonship." *CBQ* 73.1 (2011): 92–110.
- . *The Son of God in the Roman World: Divine Sonship in Its Social and Political Context*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2011.
- Piper, John. *The Justification of God: An Exegetical and Theological Study of Romans 9:1–23*. 2nd ed. Grand Rapids, Mich: Baker Books, 1993.
- Porter, Stanley E. "The Concept of Covenant in Paul." Pages 269–85 in *The Concept of the Covenant in the Second Temple Period*. Edited by Stanley E. Porter and Jacqueline C. R. De Roo. JSJSup 71. Leiden: Brill, 2003.
- Räisänen, Heikki. *Jesus, Paul and Torah: Collected Essays*. Translated by David E. Orton. Sheffield: JSOT, 1992.
- Räisänen, Heikki. *Paul and the Law*. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1986.
- Räisänen, Heikki. "Paul, God, and Israel: Romans 9–11 in Recent Research." Pages 178–206 in *Social World of Formative Christianity and Judaism: Essays in Tribute to Howard Clark Kee*. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1988.
- Reasoner, Mark. "Romans 9–11 Moves from Margin to Center, from Rejection to Salvation: Four Grids for Recent English-Language Exegesis." Pages 73–89 in *Between Gospel and Election: Explorations in the Interpretation of Romans 9–11*. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2010.
- Rossell, William H. "New Testament Adoption -- Graeco-Roman or Semitic." *JBL* 71.4 (1952): 233–34.
- Van Ruiten, Jacques T.A.G.M. *Abraham in the Book of Jubilees: The Rewriting of Genesis 11:26–25:10 in the Book of Jubilees 11:14–23:8*. JSJSup 161. Leiden: Brill, 2012.
- . *Primaeval History Interpreted: The Rewriting of Genesis 1–11 in the Book of Jubilees*. JSJSup 66. Leiden: Brill, 2000.
- . "The Covenant of Noah in Jubilees 6.1–38." Pages 167–90 in *The Concept of the Covenant in the Second Temple Period*. Edited by Stanley E. Porter and Jacqueline C. R. De Roo. JSJSup 71. Leiden: Brill, 2003.
- . "Visions of the Temple in the Book of Jubilees." Pages 215–27 in *Gemeinde Ohne Tempel*. WUNT 118. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1999.
- Sanday, William, and Arthur Cayley Headlam. *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Epistle to the Romans*. ICC. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1895.
- Schreiner, Thomas R. *Romans*. BECNT. Grand Rapids, Mich: Baker Books, 1998.

- Schwartz, Joshua. "Jubilees, Bethel and the Temple of Jacob." *HUCA* 56 (1985): 63–85.
- Schweizer, Eduard. "Υιοθεσία." *TDNT* VIII:399.
- Scott, James M. *Adoption as Sons of God: An Exegetical Investigation into the Background of HUIOTHESIA in the Pauline Corpus*. WUNT II 48. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1992.
- . *Geography in Early Judaism and Christianity: The Book of Jubilees*. SNTSMS 113. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002.
- . *On Earth as in Heaven: The Restoration of Sacred Time and Sacred Space in the Book of Jubilees*. JSJSup 91. Leiden: Brill, 2005.
- Segal, Michael. *The Book of Jubilees: Rewritten Bible, Redaction, Ideology and Theology*. JSJSup 117. Leiden: Brill, 2007.
- Snodgrass, Klyne. "Spheres of Influence: A Possible Solution to the Problem of Paul and the Law." *JSNT* 32 (1988): 93–113.
- Stendahl, Krister. *Paul among Jews and Gentiles*. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1976.
- Stone, Michael E. "Apocryphal Notes and Readings." Pages 123–31 in *Israel Oriental Studies*. Vol. 1 of. Tel Aviv: Tel Aviv University, 1971.
- Strathmann, H. "Λατρεύω, Λατρεία." *TDNT*, IV:58–65.
- Stuckenbruck, Loren T. "The Book of Jubilees and the Origin of Evil." Pages 294–308 in *Enoch and the Mosaic Torah: The Evidence of Jubilees*. Edited by Gabriele Boccaccini and Giovanni Ibba. Grand Rapids, Mich.: Eerdmans, 2009.
- Stuhlmacher, Peter. *Paul's Letter to the Romans: A Commentary*. Translated by Scott J. Hafemann. Louisville, Ky: Westminster/John Knox Press, 1994.
- Thielman, Frank. *Paul and the Law: A Contextual Approach*. Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity Press, 1994.
- Thiessen, Matthew. *Contesting Conversion: Genealogy, Circumcision, and Identity in Ancient Judaism and Christianity*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2011.
- . *Paul and the Gentile Problem*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2016.
- Tigchelaar, Eibert J. C. "Jubilees and 1 Enoch and the Issue of Transmission of Knowledge." Pages 99–101 in *Enoch and Qumran Origins: New Light on a Forgotten Connection*. Grand Rapids, Mich.: Eerdmans, 2005.
- Trick, Bradley R. *Abrahamic Descent, Testamentary Adoption, and the Law in Galatians: Differentiating Abraham's Sons, Seed, and Children of Promise*. NovTSup 169. Leiden: Brill, 2016.

- . “Sons, Seed, and Children of Promise in Galatians: Discerning the Coherence in Paul’s Model of Abrahamic Descent”. Ph.D. diss., Duke University, 2010.
- VanderKam, James C. *Calendars in the Dead Sea Scrolls: Measuring Time*. The Literature of the Dead Sea Scrolls. London: Routledge, 1998.
- . “Covenant and Biblical Interpretation in Jubilees 6.” Pages 92–104 in *The Dead Sea Scrolls Fifty Years after Their Discovery: Proceedings of the Jerusalem Congress, July 20-25, 1997*. Edited by Lawrence H. Schiffman, Emanuel Tov, James C. VanderKam, and Galen Marquis. Jerusalem: Israel Exploration Society, 2000.
- . “Covenant and Pentecost.” *CTJ* 37 (2002): 239–54.
- . “Putting Them in Their Place: Geography as an Evaluative Tool.” Pages 46–69 in *Pursuing the Text: Studies in Honor of Ben Zion Wacholder on the Occasion of His Seventieth Birthday*. Edited by John C. Reeves and John Kampen. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1994.
- . “Studies on the Prologue and Jubilees 1.” Pages 266–79 in *For a Later Generation: The Transformation of Tradition in Israel, Early Judaism, and Early Christianity*. Edited by Randal A. Argall, Beverly A. Bow, and Rodney Alan Werline. Harrisburg, PA: Trinity Press International, 2000.
- . “The Angel of the Presence in the Book of Jubilees.” *DSD* 7.3 (2000): 378–93.
- . “The Angel Story in the Book of Jubilees.” Pages 151–70 in *Pseudepigraphic Perspectives*. Edited by Esther G. Chazon, Michael Stone, and Avital Pinnick. STDJ 31. Leiden: Brill, 1999.
- . *The Book of Jubilees*. 2 vols. CSCO 510-511; Scriptorum Aethiopicorum 87-88. Leuven: Peeters, 1989.
- . “The End of the Matter? Jubilees 50:6-13 and the Unity of the Book.” Pages 267–84 in *Heavenly Tablets: Interpretation, Identity and Tradition in Ancient Judaism*. Edited by Lynn R. LiDonnici and Andrea Lieber. JSJSup 119. Leiden: Brill, 2007.
- . “The Origins and Purpose of the Book of Jubilees.” Pages 3–24 in *Studies in the Book of Jubilees*. Edited by Matthias Albani, Jörg Frey, and Armin Lange. TSAJ 65. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1997.
- . “The Putative Author of the Book of Jubilees.” *Journal of Semitic Studies* 26.2 (1981): 209–17.
- VanderKam, James C., and J.T. Milik. “Jubilees.” Pages 1–94 in *Qumran Cave 4: Parabiblical Texts Part 1*. Edited by Harold W. Attridge, Torleif Elgvin, Jozef T. Milik, Saul Olyan, John Strugnell, Emanuel Tov, James C. VanderKam, and Sidnie White. Vol. 13 of. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1994.
- Wacholder, Ben Zion. “Jubilees as the Super Canon: Torah-Admonition versus Torah-Commandment.” Pages 195–211 in *Legal Texts and Legal Issues: Proceedings of the*

- Second Meeting of the International Organization for Qumran Studies, Cambridge 1995 : Published in Honour of Joseph M. Baumgarten.* Edited by M. J. Bernstein, Florentino García Martínez, and John Kampen. Leiden: Brill, 1997.
- Wagner, J. Ross. *Heralds of the Good News: Isaiah and Paul "In Concert" in the Letter to the Romans.* Leiden: Brill, 2002.
- Walter, Nikolaus. "Zur Interpretation von Römer 9-11." *ZTK* 81.2 (1984): 172–95.
- Walters, James C. "Paul, Adoption, and Inheritance." Pages 42–76 in *Paul in the Greco-Roman World: A Handbook.* Edited by J. Paul Sampley. London: Trinity Press International, 2003.
- Wanamaker, Charles A. "The Son and the Sons of God: A Study in the Elements of Paul's Christological and Soteriological Thought". Ph.D. diss., University of Durham, 1980.
- Watson, Francis. *Paul and the Hermeneutics of Faith.* Second Edition. London: Bloomsbury T&T Clark, 2016.
- . *Paul, Judaism, and the Gentiles: Beyond the New Perspective.* Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 2007.
- Wells, Kyle B. *Grace and Agency in Paul and Second Temple Judaism: Interpreting the Transformation of the Heart.* NovTSup 157. Leiden: Brill, 2015.
- Werman, Cana. "'The תורה and the תעודה' Engraved on the Tablets." *DSD* 9.1 (2002): 75–103.
- Whittle, Sarah. *Covenant Renewal and the Consecration of the Gentiles in Romans.* SNTSMS 161. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2015.
- Wilckens, Ulrich. *Der Brief an Die Römer (Röm 6-11).* Vol. 2 of *EKK* 6. Zürich: Benziger, 1980.
- Wilk, Florian. "Rahmen Und Aufbau von Römer 9-11." Pages 227–53 in *Between Gospel and Election: Explorations in the Interpretation of Romans 9-11.* Edited by Florian Wilk and J. Ross Wagner. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2010.
- Wintermute, Orval S. "Jubilees: A New Translation and Introduction." Pages 35–142 in *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha.* Edited by James H. Charlesworth. Vol. 2 of. New York: Doubleday, 1985.
- Wright, Christopher J. H. *God's People in God's Land: Family, Land and Property in the Old Testament.* Exeter, England: Paternoster, 1990.
- Wright, N. T. *Paul and the Faithfulness of God.* 2 vols. London: SPCK Publishing, 2013.
- . *The Climax of the Covenant: Christ and the Law in Pauline Theology.* Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1991.

Wright, N.T. "New Exodus, New Inheritance: The Narrative Substructure of Romans 3-8." Pages 26–35 in *Romans and the People of God: Essays in Honor of Gordon D Fee on the Occasion of His 65th Birthday*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1999.

———. "The Letter to the Romans: Introduction, Commentary, and Reflections." Pages 393–770 in *NIB*. Vol. 10 of *NIB*. Nashville: Abingdon Press, 2002.

Yates, John. *The Spirit and Creation in Paul*. WUNT II 251. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2008.